From Oblivion to Fame: The History of the Palestinian Church (135–303 CE)

Oded Irshai

Some Preliminary Observations

The aim of this chapter is to describe the institutional history of the Palestinian Church in the period between the suppression of the Bar Kokhba Revolt (135 CE) and the Great Persecutions at the beginning of the fourth century.[1]

Most of our discussion will revolve around the history of the two major Palestinian sees, Jerusalem and Caesarea, the only centres about which we posses substantial and verifiable information during the period under discussion. Other, smaller, communities, like the ones in Scythopolis (Beth Shean) and Gaza, emerge into the historical limelight only at the end of the period, that is, during the Great Persecutions (*c.* 303 CE).[2] However, of the two dominant sees in our account

[1] The world of the heretical sectarian church of the different Judaeo-Christian denominations in Palestine and its reflection in rabbinic sources requires a separate and elaborate discussion that is beyond the scope of the present study (see more in note 18, below). Many of the issues of this intricate topic have recently received special attention; see, for instance, R. Bauckham, 'Jews and Jewish Christians in the Land of Israel at the Time of the Bar Kokhba War, with special reference to the Apocalypse of Peter', in *Tolerence and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. by G. Stanton and G. G. Stroumsa (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 228–38; M. C. de Boer, 'The Nazoreans: Living at the Boundary of Judaism and Christianity', in ibid., pp. 239–62; J. Taylor, 'The Phenomenon of Jewish Christianity: Reality or Scholarly Invention', *VC*, 44 (1990), 313–34; and above all, in J. Carleton Paget's concise and clear presentation, 'Jewish Christianity', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. by W. Horbury and others (Cambridge, 1984–99), III, 731–75.

[2] Eusebius, *Martyrs of Palestine,* 1.1 (Latin recension) on Procopius who was born and

much, if not most, of our attention will be given to the Church of Jerusalem, the history of which, during the second and third centuries, has been regarded time and again by leading scholars as being most obscure and wanting.

Our prime source of knowledge concerning the history of the institutional Church of the second and third centuries in Palestine is Eusebius of Caesarea's account in his *Ecclesiastical History* composed in the early decades of the fourth century,[3] and founded on a series of motifs among which the notions of the transmission of the λὸγος ἀληθὴς (true knowledge) of the Church and the authentic means by which that knowledge was transmitted, namely, the unadulterated line of succession of leaders within the Church, took pride of place.[4] Eusebius's account will dominate our narrative not only since it is our primary source of information, but also because it colours our entire view. In short, what follows is an attempt to present the early history of the institutional Church in Palestine as seen through the primal view of Eusebius. We shall try to follow Eusebius's path inasmuch as our presentation will deal predominantly with the local prelates and their vitae. As a result, our study will focus essentially not only on the chronicle of important events that shaped the course of those centres, but also on the historical spiritual image of their leaders with its possible impact on the historical ecclesiastical prominence attained by those sees.

The Jerusalem Church

In 1978, the renowned scholar of the history of Christian Jerusalem, John Wilkinson, summed up the annals of the Jerusalem Church up to the fourth century in the following manner: 'Christianity in Jerusalem makes depressing reading'.[5] Having come to that conclusion, Wilkinson then expressed his

perhaps also educated in the Church of Aelia but served as reader, interpreter from the Syriac, and an exorcist in the Church of Scythopolis, and ibid., 3.4 (Latin recension) on Agapius of Gaza.

[3] On the *History*, its date of composition and different redactions, see T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA, 1981), pp. 126–46. For a different view concerning the date of composition see A. Laoth, 'The Date of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*', *JTS*, n.s. 41 (1990), 111–23, and more recently R. W. Burgess, 'The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesisastica*', *JTS*, n.s. 48 (1997), 471–504, esp. 483–86.

[4] R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 45–59.

[5] J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It: Archaeology as Evidence* (London, 1978), p. 176. An earlier and similar appraisal of our knowledge concerning the Jerusalem Church is

astonishment at the fact that it was precisely the Jerusalem Church that was so small and weak. A similar mood can be sensed in the works of other scholars, and continues to be expressed in the present.[6]

It would seem that this pessimistic assessment is based upon the scant information that has been preserved in the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Eusebius, the bishop of Caesarea. And indeed, information about the Jerusalem Church in those days is very sporadic. Toward the end of the first century CE, Jerusalem, the centre of Jesus's activity and an important focal point of the activities of his disciples, the apostles, almost completely vanished from the Christian literature of the times. In its stead, other Christian centres began to flourish, such as Alexandria and Antioch, about whose foundation only little is known.[7]

However, paradoxical as this may seem, it is precisely these centres that were quite dominant in the historical annals, an indication of their growing status and influence. As for the centre in Rome, there were some who believed that as early as the mid-second century it enjoyed almost complete hegemony over Christendom. These scholars tended to ignore the Jerusalem Church, whom they believed had ended its role during the lifetime of the apostles.[8]

expressed by H. J. Lawlor and J. E. Oulton, *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine,* 2 vols (Cambridge, 1927–28), II, 185.

[6] W. Telfer, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa* (London, 1955), pp. 54–63; F. L. Cross, *St Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (London, 1966), pp. xiii–xiv. For later studies see E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire, AD 312–460* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 1–5; P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 1–15, esp. p. 9, where he repeats the claims made by Wilkinson.

[7] On the establishment and nature of the church in Egypt see C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 26–48; B. A. Pearson, 'Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations', in *The Roots of Egyptian Gnosticism*, ed. by C. H. Roberts and J. Goehring (Philadephia, 1986), pp. 132–60, where the background of the Egyptian Church is dealt with. More recently, see C. W. Criggs, *Early Christianity from its Origins to 451 CE* (Leiden, 1990), pp. 13–34. For the beginnings of the church in Antioch, see W. A. Meeks and R. L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (Missoula, 1978), pp. 13–22. For the roots of the Antiochene Church in the local apostolic past see W. R. Schoedel, *A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia, 1985).

[8] See especially W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubikeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934), or in its English version: *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia, 1971). The thrust of Bauer's study (on the pre-eminence of Rome) was devoted to refuting the theory of Eusebius, which held sway in most of the literature until the twentieth century, about the manner in which heresy had developed in Christianity. Bauer's study was greatly influential

An attempt has been made, however, to present a different image of the Jerusalem Church. This was done by Henry Chadwick who, in a lecture delivered in 1959, voiced the following view concerning this church after the Bar Kokhba Revolt: 'All the evidence goes to show that this Gentile Church of Jerusalem rapidly became deeply conscious of itself as the inheritor of the most primitive traditions of Christendom'.[9] Chadwick wrote this as he traced the tension within the Christian Church up to the fourth century between two models of authoritative self-identity that he termed as 'the circle' and 'the ellipse'. Rome represented the normative centre of the Church's establishment and the principles of faith (that is, the circle), while Jerusalem symbolized the historical foundation of the source from which flowed the common past (that is, the ellipse). It was Chadwick's claim that Rome was unsuccessful in its attempts to absolutely replace Jerusalem and to present itself as its sole successor. In other words, the model of the circle did not succeed in pushing aside that of the ellipse. All this notwithstanding, Chadwick saw the status of Jerusalem in this conflict not as expressing a real situation but rather as the reflection of an image, or — to use his term — a mystique, summing it up rather floridly: 'All this is in one sense poetry rather than truth, literature rather than dogma, symbol rather than cold reality'.[10] Seemingly, then, Chadwick has joined forces with the other scholars.

The moot question, therefore, is: Did the Jerusalem Church's historical status rest solely upon myth? Could it be that during a lengthy period of time — from

long after its publication. See, e.g., the survey of the research on this topic published by D. J. Harrington, 'The Reception of Walter Bauer's *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* during the Last Decade', *HTR*, 73 (1980), 289–98. Bauer, however, completely ignored the Jerusalem Church and its Jewish-Christian foundation, a church from which he could have drawn important evidence to support his theory concerning the strength and authority of a group that would in time be considered heretical. On this aspect see especially G. Strecker in the appendix to the English translation, p. 241. For a more recent innovative consideration of Bauer's concept, see R. Williams, 'Does it Make Sense to Speak of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy', in *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. by R. Williams (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 1–23. This being the case, we who primarily follow Eusebius — the primary source for the early history of the Jerusalem Church — should be doubly cautious.

[9] H. Chadwick, *The Circle and the Ellipse: Rival Concepts of Authority in the Early Church — Inaugural Lecture, University of Oxford, 5 May 1959* (Oxford, 1959), p. 6.

[10] Chadwick, *Circle and the Ellipse*, p. 7. It is quite tempting to regard Irenaeus's words about the centrality of 'the mother city (*metropolis*) of the citizens of the new covenant' and other remarks by him to that effect (*Haer.* 3.12, 5, and 5.4, 34–35,2) as reflecting some sort of reality rather than myth or allegory.

the late first century until the beginning of the fourth century — this myth was not cultivated and enhanced by realities that gradually took shape within this church? For it is quite doubtful whether the Jerusalem Church's claim to a special status — a demand that was partially accepted at the Council of Nicaea — appeared out of the blue during the third decade of the fourth century. What lay behind the declarative aspect of the famous Seventh Canon adopted at Nicaea in 325, which bestowed an honoured status upon the Jerusalem Church,[11] was the conviction that the church was deserving of a special standing, even though the term *apostolic status* was not used in this context. Both the phrasing of the demand itself, of which we know nothing and can only speculate, and the aforementioned recognition by the council developed in an earlier historical setting.[12] The second and third centuries in the history of the Jerusalem Church are replete with serial attempts on its part to shore up its political and ecclesiastical standing side by side with efforts to shape its image as an apostolic church (Ἀποστολικὸς θρόνος)[13] — a church whose spiritual assets evolved from the earliest days of Christianity.

Study of this issue has been relegated to the sidelines, and even when conducted has been inadequate,[14] because — as we have seen — scholars have been faced with a paucity of sources relevant to this process and had to avail themselves of the almost single eclectic historiographic source, the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Eusebius, whose own sources are only partially known. Thus, from

[11] H. Chadwick, 'Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea', *HTR*, 53 (1960), 173–74.

[12] Though it seems quite plausible to argue that the Seventh Canon was born as a result of very recent squabbles between the leaders of the Jerusalem see (Macarius) and that of Caesarea (Eusebius) primarily on matters of doctrine, i.e., the Arian heresy, see my study, 'The Dark Side of the Moon: Historical Junctures in the Political Career of Eusebius of Caesarea', *Cathedra* (forthcoming; Hebrew).

[13] For this concept and its significance in the context of the Roman Church, see V. Twomey, *Apostolikos Thronos: The Primacy of Rome as Reflected in the Church History of Eusebius and the Historico-Apologetic Works of St Athanasius the Great* (Münster, 1982). It is noteworthy that the term θρόνος (literally 'chair/see') in relation to the chain of authority and leadership is used in nine of its twelve appearances in Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica* in connection with no other than the Jerusalem Church.

[14] See S. Vaillhé, 'Formation du Patriarcat de Jérusalem', *Echos d'Orient*, 13 (1910), 325–33. Vaillhé's central argument is that the Jerusalem Church had always been under the aegis of Caesaera, and only in 196 — probably in connection with the controversy over the date of Easter — did it receive the honoured apostolic status. See also our discussion, pp. 105–21.

an historical perspective what follows is an attempt to expose the reality that lay behind the 'mystique' which Chadwick has pointed out.[15]

However, uncovering that reality is not the central thrust of this study; I shall try to concentrate on the underlying causes that shaped the development I have set out to reconstruct. I believe that there were two major causes, of a dialectic nature, that determined the course of events. On the one hand, the Jerusalem Church claimed precedence within the Palestinian Church and did all it could to maintain the spiritual and historical chain of succession from the early days of the 'Mother Church' during the first century. On the other hand, this very same church, which after the Bar Kokhba Revolt had become a 'Church of the Gentiles', wished to rid itself of the weighty burden of its past — that of the 'Church of the Circumcision' and of the Jewish heritage that preceded it. Let it be clear: we are not referring to a direct and explicit polemical stance against the Jewish and Jewish-Christian past. However, certain events and episodes, as well as the creation of some alternative 'apostolic' images by leaders of the 'Church of the Gentiles' throughout the second century and in particular during its last decades, indicate an effort to create a new heritage intended to supplant that of the 'Church of the Circumcision'. During the third century, after the Jerusalem Church had shaped its new image, it assumed a central role in the polemic against the heresies that spread in and around Palestine.

The Early Church of Aelia: Transformation of an Historical Image

Following the demise of Bar Kokhba and the crushing of his revolt, the scene in and around Jerusalem was altered. An era had come to an end. In the eyes of Christians such as the author of the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila, the actions of Hadrian (and not of his Flavian predecessors) in founding the pagan colony of Aelia Capitolina on the ruins of the Jewish town of old marked the divine fulfilment of Jesus's famous prophecy (Matt. 24. 2): 'There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down'.[16] A similar sentiment lamenting the destruction of the Temple in finite terms was voiced by the rabbis

[15] See my opening remark.

[16] *The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and Timothy and Aquila*, ed. by F. C. Conybeare (Oxford, 1898), p. 98. The earliest layers of this text have recently been convincingly dated to the third century; see J. Z. Pastis, 'Dating the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila: Revisiting the Earlier *Vorlage* Hypothesis', *HTR*, 95 (2002), 169–95.

too.[17] Contrary to Roman historians but in accordance with the general Christian view, Eusebius also described the foundation of the pagan city as a consequence of the Jewish revolt rather than as the cause of it. Thus, seen from a Christian perspective the foundation of pagan Aelia had one — and only one — reason: to eradicate from history and memory the wretched Jewish city and its traitorous past, thus (at least at the time) completely ignoring the anti-Christian aspect of the establishment of Aelia.

What really transpired in the city colonized by the Roman garrison is not entirely clear, but two major changes can safely be pointed out. The first, though least discussed, aspect of the history of Aelia is the transformation of the ethnic identity and demography of the local inhabitants; the second, a change in the structure and layout of the newly founded pagan colony.

In regard to the changes in the human matrix of Jerusalem, all sources dealing with the events surrounding the Jewish revolt point out some sort of change in the population of the town: on the one hand, an influx of 'Hellenes' (soldiers, citizens coming from elsewhere who envied the advantages of the Roman colony, and possible also people from Arabian and Syrian stock); on the other hand, desertion of (not expulsion from) the city by its Jews.[18] In a somewhat

[17] '"Hew thee". This bears out what Scripture says, "A time to cast away stones [...]" R. Tanhuma said: "What is the meaning of 'A time to cast away stones'?" There was a time for Hadrian [...] to come up and break in pieces the stones of the Temple' (Midrash Rabbah, Deut. 3. 13; *Midrash Rabbah*, trans. by J. Rabbinowitz, under the editorship of H. Freedman and M. Simon (with a Foreword by I. Epstein), 10 vols [London, 1939], VIII, 82–83). Cf. Eusebius's testimony about his own times: 'Jerusalem is inhabited by foreigners, and stones from the Temple were taken to build temples to the gods' (Eusebius, *Eusesbius Werke*, VI: *Demonstratio evangelica*, ed. by I. A. Heikel, GCS, 23 (Leipzig, 1913), 8.3 (p. 393)).

[18] On the pagan nature of the colony and its profound cultic world, see recently N. Belayche, *Iudaea-Palaestina: The Pagan Cults in Roman Palestine (Second to Fourth Century)* (Tübingen, 2001), pp. 108–70. As to the so-called 'expulsion' of the Jews enforced by a Hadrianic 'edict', a tradition promoted by Christian authors, see O. Irshai, 'Constantine and the Jews: The Prohibition against Entering Jerusalem — History and Historiography', *Zion*, 60 (1995), 129–78 (129–35) (Hebrew). One aspect, though, of this transmutation in the human matrix remains unsolved, namely the possible lingering presence of some Judaeo-Christians in the city. For the Bordeaux Pilgrim (*c.* 333 CE) as well as Epiphanius (later in that century) relate about a synagogue of the Jews that remained on Mount Zion until the days of Maximus the Jerusalem bishop (d. *c.* 346 CE). The possibility that it was a Jewish gathering place is hardly tenable, but on the other hand, that it served a local small Judaeo-Christian contingent has been propagated by a few scholars, some of whom have drawn attention to additional contemporary apocryphal material attesting their presence. For a recent (though seemingly overzealous) treatment of this issue within the wider context of the Judaeo-Christian presence

retrospective look on the dawn of the new era of Christian Jerusalem, Eusebius described the human face of pagan Aelia as yet another fulfilment of the prophetic words of Jesus (Luke 21. 24, based on a biblical prophecy): 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled'.[19]

Least of all, however, is known about the transformation undergone by the local Christian community.[20] One may postulate that with the end of Jewish presence in the city, at least for some decades, the local Judaeo-Christian element (essentially of the Nazarene denomination) declined as well and might have also assimilated into the growing community of Gentile stock that became the backbone of the new local 'Church of the Gentiles', though it should be assumed that this process within the Christian community was a rather slow one.[21]

Alongside changes in the human infrastructure of Jerusalem, the Romans made a great effort to transform the physical layout of the city or, according to some, even to alter its perimeter.[22] Here we are on firmer ground.

in Roman Palestine during the period under discussion here, see S. Verhelst, *Les Traditions Judéo-Chrétiennes dans la liturgie de Jérusalem* (Leuven, 2003), pp. 187–207.

[19] Eusebius, *Theophania*, 4.20 (p. 252).

[20] The history and fate of the Christian community during the days of Roman Aelia are still regarded as obscure and, in fact, the city itself was outside the focus of contemporary Christian interest; see Belayche, pp. 113–14. It seems as though Belayche's assessment was determined by the overwhelming thrust of her study to portray Aelia Capitolina as a Roman idolatrous colony through and through. It is interesting to note that the Christian presence in Jerusalem before and after the Bar Kokhba Revolt is also absent from the most recent studies of this episode in the history of Roman Palestine; see the recent assemblage of an otherwise fascinating new collection of studies by various scholars, *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered*, ed. by P. Schäfer (Tübingen, 2003). For an attempt to address this void, see my study 'The Church of Jerusalem — From the "Church of the Circumcision" to the "Church of the Gentiles"', in *The History of Jerusalem: The Roman and Byzantine Periods*, ed. by Y. Tsafrir and S. Safrai (Jerusalem, 1999), pp. 61–114 (pp. 91–93) (Hebrew), and more in the present study.

[21] See my discussion at note 1, above, and more below

[22] This aspect of the history of Aelia has received ample attention in recent scholarship, though in light of the historical traditions and archaeological data scholars differ on the nature and scope of the changes imposed by the Romans. For three recent scholarly reconstructions of Roman Aelia, see Y. Tsafrir, 'The Topography and Archaeology of Aelia Capitolina', in *The History of Jerusalem: The Roman and Byzantine Periods* (see note 20, above), pp. 115–66 (Hebrew); Belayche, *Iudaea-Palaestina*; and, more recently, Y. Z. Eliav, 'The Urban Layout of Aelia Capitolina: A New View from the Perspective of the Temple Mount', in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered* (see note 20, above), pp. 241–77.

The change in name and the creation of the pagan infrastructure of the city — which included the erection of a temple to Aphrodite on the site that two centuries later would be identified as Golgotha, the placing of statues on the Temple Mount,[23] as well as the construction of an *Asclepion* on the site of the Probatica ('Sheep's Pool'; Προβατική)[24] — removed the last vestiges of the Second Temple city and laid the foundations for the change in how Jerusalem's Christians related to what surrounded them. In the middle of the second century, one of the earliest pilgrims of which we have any knowledge, Melito of Sardis, vaguely noted a local tradition that located the site of the Crucifixion of Jesus 'in the middle of Jerusalem',[25] but the process by which many other traditions relating to the history of the Jewish and Christian city would sink into almost complete oblivion was unavoidable.

One conspicuous aspect noted by scholars of pilgrimage to the Holy Land was the biblical inspiration that almost solely motivated the early pilgrims.[26] It is reasonable to assume that even Alexander of Cappadocia (later to become bishop of Jerusalem), who came on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem early in the third century 'for the purpose of prayer and investigation of the [sacred] places',[27] did not come to see the Jerusalem of 'Jesus and his Apostles' but the city of 'the prophets and the kings'. Jerusalem became the scene of an advanced process of blurring the past which can only in part be put down to the pagan climate that developed on the ruins of the Jewish city. It seems as if the new 'Church of the

[23] Of Gaius and Titus, according to Origen, *Fragmenta in Mathaeum* (Origen, *Mattäuserklärung III: Fragmente*, ed. by E. Klostermann, GCS, 41/1 (Leipzig, 1941)), p. 194; in honour of Hadrian, according to the Bordeaux Pilgrim (*Itinerarium Burdigalense*, ed. by P. Geyer and O. Cuntz, in *Itineraria et alia geographica*, CCSL, 175 (Turnhout, 1965), p. 16). Jerome, Epistle 58.3 (to Paulina) mentions the statues of Jupiter and Venus. The transformation of the Temple Mount into a pagan site may have involved the erection of a temple to Jupiter, though this is far from clear; see Belayche, pp. 136–42; Eliav, pp. 264–73.

[24] See Tsafrir, 'Topography', p. 158.

[25] Peri Pascha, XCIII (Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha, and Fragments*, ed. by S. G. Hall (Oxford, 1979), p. 52; Eng. trans., p. 53). In recent decades there have been some who question the validity of the testimony of Melito; see P. Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient* (Paris, 1985), p. 33, n. 52; for an opposing view, see Hunt, p. 3; see also R. L. Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (London, 1986), p. 476.

[26] Hunt, pp. 3–5; Walker, pp. 11–12.

[27] Eusebius, *HE* 6.11, 2 (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. by E. Schwartz, GCS, 9, 1–2 (Leipzig, 1903–08), p. 540; English translation, *The Ecclesiastical History*, trans. by K. Lake and J. E. Oulton, LCL, 2 vols (London, 1949–53), II, 37).

Gentiles' was also partly responsible for this process, otherwise it is difficult to explain how a chapter in the history of the city, that of Second Temple Jerusalem, is almost entirely missing from the earliest pilgrim account by the Bordeaux Pilgrim (333 CE), who most likely recorded the traditions he heard from local Christians, primarily still reflecting the world of second- and third-century Jerusalem. The Jerusalem described by the anonymous pilgrim was the renewed Christian city of the time of Constantine that was comprised, on the one hand, of sites connected with the trial and death of Jesus and with pagan Aelia Capitolina — the utmost expression of the ruin of the Jews, and on the other hand, of sites of the biblical Jerusalem, where everything began. To the Bordeaux Pilgrim, the Temple Mount was the location of the Temple of Solomon, not that of Herod. Jesus's activity, and his wondrous acts in Jerusalem, just like the lives of the apostles and the martyrs' deaths in the city, faded almost entirely from the local collective memory.[28]

A similar impression is given by Eusebius's *Onomasticon*, that he compiled at the request of his friend Paulinus, the bishop of Tyre, in 312/13 or perhaps even later. This was the last of a series of four works, the first three of which are lost, that included one in which 'I drew, like on a drawing sheet, the plan of their renowned metropolis of early days — i.e., Jerusalem — and [the plan of] the Temple therein with additional explanations of the sites'.[29]

It is highly improbable that in drawing the plan of Jerusalem Eusebius supplied more information than he included in the *Onomasticon*, but it should be noted that in that work there is only a partial description, to say the least, of Second Temple Jerusalem. However, the full exposition of this historical,

[28] This is most conspicuous in relation to James, 'the brother of Jesus' and founder of the 'mother church'. Hagiographic traditions, as well as a few snippets of realia, linked to this figure and fostered by the church in Aelia; for instance, his throne, shown to visitors in the third century (Eusebius, *HE* 7.19), has been omitted from later descriptions. Without going into further discussion, one should assume that the cult connected with this saint became somewhat dim toward the turn of the third century (though it was revived later during the fifth century, see O. Limor, 'The Origins of a Tradition: King David's Tomb on Mt. Zion', *Traditio*, 44 (1988), 453–62). Wilkinson's attempt to find some significance in a quantitative comparison of the number of sites (those of the Old Testament as against the ones that appear in the New Testament and later) somewhat distorts the rather complicated picture. See J. Wilkinson, 'Jewish Holy Places and the Origins of Christian Pilgrimage', in *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, ed. by R. Ousterhout (Urbana, 1990), pp. 41–53.

[29] Eusebius, *Das Onomastkon der biblischen Ortsnamen*, ed. by E. Klostermann, GCS, 11/1 (Leipzig, 1904). We give this late date for its composition on the basis of A. Louth, 'The Date of Eusebius' Historia Ecclesiastica', *JTS*, n.s. 40 (1989), 118–20.

topographical, and theological issue, in which Eusebius chose to ignore the city and the temple wherein Jesus and his disciples were active, was presented in his description of the Temple. Though, as noted, this description has not survived, Eusebius informs us elsewhere of its scope and contents, this in his lengthy ceremonial sermon delivered on the occasion of the consecration in 315 of a new church built by Paulinus in Tyre. If we strip this sermon of its obviously rhetorical garb,[30] it turns out that the historical model of the Temple (including its spiritual foundations) used by Eusebius, on which he cast the new church, was the biblical model of the tabernacle of Bezalel and the Temple of Solomon, which were being rebuilt through the agency of 'Zerubbabel' (Paulinus), 'who bestowed upon the temple of God that glory which greatly exceeded the former'.[31] Eusebius's reconstruction of the biblical, rather than the Herodian, model of the Temple led him to sketch the real architectural form of the church in Tyre in terms of the future temple described in the vision of Ezekiel.[32]

Obviously, the famous Herodian Temple, with whose plan Eusebius may have been well acquainted through the works of Josephus, was doomed to be forgotten and to serve, in its ruin, only as ongoing testimony of the punishment inflicted upon the Jews because of their plot against the Saviour. To further this intent, at that very same time Eusebius wrote in his *Demonstratio evangelica* (*c.* 318 CE) that the purpose of pilgrimage to Jerusalem in his days (and there is no reason to believe that it was otherwise before that) was no more than to view the destruction of the Jews. Proof of this is provided by their guides as they stand on the Mount of Olives, the place where Jesus had trodden, and look toward the desolate Temple Mount.[33]

If indeed this was the true state of affairs, these images of Jerusalem indicate the presence of an additional dimension in the Christian historiosophic interpretation of the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem — a dimension that involves ignoring all positive imagery of Second Temple Jerusalem, especially of the Temple itself. It could be that what fuelled this attitude, to no little degree, was the fact that the shape of the Temple or its utensils remained

[30] Eusebius, *HE* 10.3–4; 72 (pp. 860–83). For the rhetorical overtones see C. Smith, 'Christian Rhetoric in Eusebius' Panegyric at Tyre', *VC*, 43 (1989), 226–47.

[31] For Bezalel and Solomon, see Eusebius, *HE* 10.4, 2–3; 25 (p. 862); for Zerubbabel, see ibid., 4, 2–3; 30 (p. 870; Eng. trans., II, 399).

[32] See J. Wilkinson, 'Paulinus' Temple at Tyre', *JÖB*, 16 (1982) (= *International Byzantinistkongress, Akten*, III/4), 553–61.

[33] Eusebius, *Demonstratio evangelica*, 6.18, 23 (p. 278).

fixed in the consciousness of the Jews, either as illustrations and decorations in their synagogues, or in the blatant messianic contexts such as in the coins struck by Bar Kokhba.[34]

The place of the Herodian Temple and Jerusalem as the prevalent historical and spiritual models was quickly replaced in the Constantinian plan of Jerusalem by the reintroduction of the Temple of Solomon and the image of King Solomon in a new Christian garb.[35] The roots of this image should perhaps be sought in the ideological shift whose initial fruits were presented in Eusebius's sermon at the dedication of the church in Tyre. It could be that in the process of forging anew the local past and reshaping its desired image, several concepts, personalities, and locations that were linked to the Jewish periphery of Jerusalem and to the 'Church of the Circumcision' had been by some sort of process consigned to oblivion. This is exemplified by the silence of the Bordeaux Pilgrim concerning the throne of James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, and his tomb, located near the corner of the Temple — things that this church had held in high regard, at least during part of the period of the early Aelia Capitolina Church, and served as the city's source of veneration for pilgrims and curious visitors to the city.[36] Those attempts by the new Jerusalem Church, either already during the early stages of the Aelia period or soon thereafter, to deny its Jewish and Jewish-Christian past, even if they were done subconsciously, were to its detriment, for they stripped the local community of some of its historical-spiritual assets. Thus the image of its unbroken apostolic heritage, upon which every Christian centre prided itself and which provided the source of its authority and political power within the wider Church, was blemished. As we shall see further on, an acute need to restore these spiritual assets — whose memory became ever and ever dimmer — arose toward the turn of the second century. Let us now dwell upon the circumstances leading to the Aelia Church's adverse condition, and the ways and means by which it managed to overcome it.

[34] See in greater detail in B. Kühnel's study, *From the Earthly to the Heavenly Jerusalem: Representation of the Holy City in Christian Art of the First Millenium* (Freiburg, 1987), pp. 107–10. On the coins of Bar Kokhba, see J. Patrich, 'The Golden Vine, the Sanctuary Portal and Its Depiction on the Bar-Kokhba Coins', *Journal of Jewish Art*, 19/20 (1993–94), 56–61.

[35] See J. Schwartz, 'The Encaenia of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Temple of Solomon and the Jews', *TZ*, 43 (1987), 265–81; S. Ferber, 'The Temple of Solomon in Early Christian and Byzantine Art', in *The Temple of Solomon: Archeology, Fact and Medieval Tradition in Christian, Islamic and Jewish Art*, ed. by J. Gutmann (Missoula, 1976), pp. 21–43.

[36] On James's throne, see Eusebius, *HE* 7.19.

The Aelia Church from Mark to Narcissus (135–c. 190): The Need for Change

The information we have about these few decades in the history of the 'Church of the Gentiles' is somewhat vague. We have at our disposal nothing except some hints about the visits of itinerants, such as Melito of Sardis, and of scholar-apologists, such as Hegesippus, who probably visited the Jerusalem Christian community in his attempts to study its past. To this we may add a list of local bishops about whom we have no further information, a list whose internal chronology is a point of contention not only among modern-day scholars, but also among the ancient authors who recorded it. The corpus of scant information about the Jerusalem Church during that period stands in glaring contrast to what we know about contemporary developments in other Christian centres such as Asia Minor, Rome, Alexandria, and perhaps even in a less famous one — Edessa.[37]

It would seem that it was precisely the transformation undergone by the Jerusalem Church that precipitated its relegation to relative oblivion. The creation of a new church and a new ecclesiastical establishment without a direct link with the past created a sort of rift in the historical continuum and to some extent severed the local apostolic tradition. Paradoxically, it was precisely at the moment when the Jerusalem Church was being transformed into a 'Church of the Gentiles', like all the other centres, that it came dangerously close to fully eradicating its historic status as the 'mother of all churches', at the centre of Chadwick's mystical 'ellipse' — the circle that united the Church from its very beginnings.

In the wake of this arose a need to bring about a change in the image of the local church. Perhaps one of the outstanding attributes of this change is the local list of succession of bishops of the Jerusalem Church of the Gentiles that lists the bishops from Mark to Narcissus and stresses its numerical symmetry (fifteen bishops) with the earlier list of the Church of the Circumcision, whose roots lay

[37] See note 7, above. For a study of the development of the Christian centre in Edessa at this time, its Jewish-Christian roots, and its links to the early Jerusalem Church, see L. W. Barnard, 'The Origins and Emergence of the Church in Edessa during the First Two Centuries AD', *VC*, 22 (1968), 167–75. There is still some confusion, however, about the early roots of this Church. See the straightforward comments on this issue by S. P. Brock, 'Eusebius and Syrian Christianity', in *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, ed. by H. A. Attridge and G. Hata (Detroit, 1992), pp. 212–34, esp. 227, and more recently in S. K. Ross, *Roman Edessa: Politics and Culture in the Eastern Fringes of the Roman Empire, 114–242 CE* (London, 2001), pp. 117–44.

in the apostolic age. As we shall see, it would seem that it was Eusebius (or his source) that realized the potential of this representation, for he presents Narcissus (the last bishop on the latter list) and not Mark (the first on the list) as the key figure of the new order. This is apparent from the manner in which the members of the Jerusalem Church presented Narcissus and his image as a charismatic leader in similarity to the traits attributed to James, the founder and leader of the Mother Church and in the spirit of the leadership of the succeeding Church of the Circumcision. What lay behind this list, which had doubtful prosopographical and chronological foundations, particularly in light of the much smaller number of bishops comprising the lists of other major centres (Rome, Antioch, and others)? Most scholars who have dealt with the list and its authenticity have paid attention primarily to the timing of its appearance and to the identification of those who might have diffused it, but not to its most important aspect: the circumstances that brought it about, to the notions it intended to convey, and the change it symbolized.[38]

[38] C. H. Turner, 'The Early Episocopal Lists–II', *JTS*, 1 (1900), 529–33 (citing there earlier studies); H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen, 1949), pp. 286–88; A. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church* (London, 1953), pp. 35–61; Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, pp. 48–51. The differences between the lists in the various sources deserve closer scrutiny, which is outside the scope of the present essay. However, some comment is in order. Contrary to the opinions of the above-cited scholars on the provenance and tendencies of the Jerusalem list, I believe that it was shaped largely against the background of local developments. It ought to be considered as part of the general process of the dissemination of bishop lists only to the extent that it enhanced the image of an unbroken chain of transmission of local traditions as a barrier against the spread of heresy, as was the case in the other centres of Christianity. See, in general, H. von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power* (Berkeley, 1969), pp. 169–73. The possibility that the Jerusalem list might have been forged in an imitation of the genealogy found in the 'Infancy Gosepls' (predominantly in Matt. 1) of two sequel lists of fifteen bishops (the latter fifteen from Marcus to Narcissus based on the list given by Eusebius in his *Chronicle* — compare with the sequels of fourteen generations in Matthew) is quite suggestive, particularly in light of the fact that the most important figures in the lists were James, the first on the list (compare with King David in Matthew), and Narcissus, last on the list (compare with Christ in Matthew). In addition, regardless of the problem posed by the possible dubious nature of the list, one is struck by the compelling character of the Judaeo-Christian list (Eusebius, *HE*, 4.5, 2–3) of which ending contains four names: Levi, Ephres, Joseph, and Judas, names that not only symbolize the leading tribes of Israel of messianic stock (of royal and priestly lineage), but also appear at important junctures in the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew. Thus, seen from this possible vantage point, it becomes quite apparent how the dissemination of such a list (notwithstanding its doubtful reliability) could have enhanced the

However, it seems that the need for a transformation in the local church's image was not triggered only by a local domestic necessity. It was caused by an external threat. According to Eusebius's description, two developments engulfing the entire Christian *oikumene* in the latter part of the second century placed on the Christian agenda issues that had bearing on both the historical and eschatological status of Jerusalem as a city, and at the same time on the basic concepts 'apostolic heritage', thus affecting the historical ecclesiastical stance of the Jerusalem Church. It is these two developments that we would like to address: first, the seeming marginalization of Jerusalem's centrality in some Christian eschatological schemes; second, an attempt by the Church of Rome to enforce ritual uniformity upon the Christian world, predominantly in regard to the date of the Easter celebration, contesting in the process the validity of local apostolic customs.

The Montanists and Jerusalem

The Montanist movement,[39] a charismatic heretical sect which emerged in Phrygia, in Asia Minor, during the sixties and early seventies of the second century in the wake of an outburst of ecstatic prophetic visions, quickly spread to Rome and North Africa. Its popular, prophetic tenets entailed a real danger — at least so believed its opponents in Rome — to the framework of the

local political and ecclesiastical image and esteem. Recently it has been suggested that one should seek the cultural roots of this trend of creation and use of these 'succession lists' and 'chains of tradition' in both the early rabbinic and Christian worlds, in the cultural setup created by the eastern Greek intellectual movement, the 'Second Sophistic'; see A. Tropper, 'The Fate of Jewish Historiography after the Bible: A New Interpretation', *History and Theory*, 43 (2004), 179–94.

[39] For the sake of clarity and simplicity I use the term 'Montanist', which was not the original name of the movement that was better known in its initial stages as the 'New Prophecy' or 'Phrygian heresy'; cf. A. Jenesen, 'Prisca-Maximilla-Montanus: Who Was the Founder of Montanism?' *Studia Patristica*, 26 (1993), 147–50. Among the many studies concerning this movement, see especially, P. de Labriolle, *La Crise montaniste* (Paris, 1913); W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 290–94; W. H. C. Frend, 'Montanism: A Movement of Prophecy and Regional Identity in the Early Church', *BJRL*, 70 (1988), 25–35; A. Strobel, *Das heilige Land der Montanisten* (Berlin, 1980); Fox, pp. 404–07; and more recently, C. Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge, 1996).

transmission of the apostolic tradition that was beginning to take on an established, hierarchical pattern.[40]

Two of the central components of the Montanist 'creed' that stood out during the early years of this sect's existence were ascetic nomism and, slightly later, an extreme form of messianism.[41] Epiphanius of Salamis tells us that the prophetess Maximilia proclaimed that she would be succeeded by no other prophets, only by the End of Days. She made this claim while utilizing well-known signs of the End of Days — plagues and other natural catastrophes — that hit Asia Minor during the sixties of that century.[42] Though in principle this 'prophecy' did not digress from the messianic vision propounded by the school of Irenaeus of Lyon of the coming millennium, the emphasis placed on its immanence was something new.

Apocalyptic concepts that were originally expressed in *Revelation*, written in Asia Minor toward the end of the first century, were adopted by Montanus's assistant, the prophetess Priscilla. She claimed that the site of future eschatological events would not be in Jerusalem, but rather in the small Phrygian

[40] The controversy between the Roman Church and the Montanist sect did not centre round the value of the prophecy of Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla (i.e., whether it was a false prophecy or not), but rather on the very existence and validity of prophecy or revelation in the post-apostolic era. See R. E. Heine, 'The Role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy', *Second Century*, 6 (1987/88), 11–19.

[41] Eusebius notes, in the name of Appollonius who wrote a severe attack against the Montanists toward the end of the first generation of its existence, that Montanus himself 'enacted fasts' and 'taught the annulment of marriage'. This was more than mere preaching — it was an attempt to introduce an obligatory life of abstinence and celibacy as an integral part of the preparations for the End of Days. See Eusebius, *HE* 5.18, 2 (p. 472).

[42] On the atmosphere — brought about by plagues, wars, and barbaric invasions — which most probably agitated the strong feelings among the Montanists of the approaching End of Days, see Trevett's careful assessments, *Montanism*, pp. 42–45. The radical messianic outlook emerged toward the end of the century in the wake of Maximilla's proclamation made near her death in 179 (Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus LXXX haereses*, ed. by K. Holl, 3 vols, GCS, 25, 31, 37 (Leipzig, 1915–1931), 48.2, 4 (pp. 221–22); English translation, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Book I [Sects. 1–46]*, trans. by F. Williams, Nag Hammadi Studies, 35 (Leiden, 1987)); see also, de Labriolle, pp. 68 ff.; and recently, C. Trevett, 'Eschatological Timetabling and the Montanist Prophet Maximilla', *Studia Patristica*, 31 (1997), 218–24. Her claim heightened even more among the sect's followers the sense of living in radical catastrophic times. See, *in extenso*, D. Powell, 'Tertullianists and Cataphrygians', *VC*, 29 (1975), 33–54, esp. 41–49; for a short discussion, see T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 130–31.

city of Pepuza, to which the heavenly Jerusalem would descend.[43] This concept, about whose emergence during the first generation of the sect's existence there is much doubt, did entail a threat to Jerusalem's hegemony in the scheme of the End of Days.[44] However, it would seem that the movement of the 'New Prophecy' must have posed yet another serious challenge to the status of Christian Jerusalem, namely, the new ascetic-prophetic society that the movement's founders wished to create in their own centre in Asia Minor. It was not of the 'heavenly Jerusalem' that Jerusalem's Christians would have to beware, but rather of the rise of another 'Earthly Jerusalem' presenting an alternative mode of life and image to that presented by the historic city and mother community. This was how Appollonius, one of the fiercest opponents of Montanism, described the 'new Jerusalem' that had arisen in Pepuza at the turn of the last decade of the second century:

> It was he [...] who gave the name of Jerusalem to Pepuza and Tymion, which are little towns in Phrygia, and wished to hold assemblies there from everywhere, who appointed collectors of money, who organized the receiving of gifts [...] who provided salaries for those who preached his doctrine.[45]

Even though our informant was one of the sect's sharpest opponents, there is no reason to doubt the veracity of his testimony. To this we should add the account provided by Eusebius of the institutional framework of this movement that — in addition to the commonplace components — also included the formation of communal fellowship, the κοινωνός, which more than anything else

[43] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 49.1, 1, but Epiphanius (or his source) did no more than attribute this prophecy to a later prophetess by the name of Quintilla. See too Weizsächer, as qtd. by de Labriolle, p. 89, and more recently Powell, pp. 44–45. These scholars believe that this apocalyptic outlook concerning the future of Pepuza dates from a later period in the development of Montanism. Recent scholarship tends rather to tone down the presence of an eschatological atmosphere within the early phases of the movement; see Trevett, 'Eschatological Timetabling'. Concerning the renaming of Pepuza as Jerusalem, Trevett, *Montanism*, pp. 99–100, has suggested seeing it as an act similar to that of the Patriarch Jacob in relation to Bethel, and not as an effort to strip historical Jerusalem of its status.

[44] See Powell.

[45] Eusebius, *HE* 5.18, 2 (p. 472). The collection of money initiated by and for the centre at Pepuza might have been established in imitation to the custom described in the NT concerning the donations to the Jerusalem mother community.

was symbolic of the social and spiritual reality in the Mother Church of Jerusalem.[46]

Obviously, all these involved an attempt to revivify the Jerusalem of the apostolic period, the historical symbol of ecclesiastical unity, and at the same time to transfer it to a new location. Thus, though lacking straightforward testimony, it nonetheless seems plausible to postulate that the latter development and the growing impact of the Montanist movement, of which the Jerusalemite Christians were aware, might have set quite a challenge to their exclusive historical status and image. Moreover, the heretical aspiration concerning the transfer of the scene of the End of Days to Pepuza — the 'Jerusalem that is descending from the Heavens' — was another affirmation of the dangerous change in the historical image of Christian Jerusalem.[47]

[46] Hieronymus, Epistle 51, 3 (Hieronymus, *Episotlae*, ed. by I. Hilberg, 3 vols, CSEL, 54–56 (Vienna 1910–1918), I, 311–12: 'With us [...] the bishops occupy the place of the apostles, but with them a bishop ranks not first but third. For while they put first the patriarchs of Pepuza in Phrygia, and place next to these the ministers called stewards [cenones]'; English translation, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2nd edn, 2nd ser., 14 vols (Grand Rapids, 1983), VI, 56). Hilberg assumed that the word *cenones* came from the Greek term κοινωνός. This term might have signified an association or fellowship of some kind or perhaps a spiritual companionship as found in NT sources; see Trevett, *Monasticism*, pp. 212–14. But see also the thorough discussion on the term in W. Tabbernee, 'Montanist Regional Bishops: New Evidence from Ancient Inscriptions', *JECS*, 1 (1993), 249–80, esp. 257–63. Tabbernee concludes that κοινωνός designated Montanist regional bishops.

[47] The institutional construct created by the Montanists, which was steeped with apostolic symbolism, fitted in well with Montanus's aim to transform the two Phrygian cities into a centre that resembled Jerusalem, and to cement the loyalty of the sect's believers, wherever they might be, to those two centres by collecting donations for them. It is quite easy to discern that this pattern of a relationship between a diaspora community and the centre was what underlay the relations between the mother church in Jerusalem and the other communities in the days of the apostles and Paul. The use of the name 'Jerusalem' to denote those new centres was a declaration not only of the ritual significance attached to the congregation of believers in the ecclesiastical centre, but also of their subordination to that centre and to the tidings that emanated from it, with all this implied (see above). Attachment to the centre, achieved through the collection of money, was intended to channel the sense of solidarity with the centre toward more practical expressions. On the internal order and hierarchy, see Tabbernee. The Jerusalemite Church's awareness of the Phrygian heresy is apparent through the fact that among the few items in its archive or library described in short by Eusebius was 'the *Dialogue of Gaius* [from the days of Zephyrinus of Rome, i.e. before 217 CE] with Proclus a champion of the heresy of the Phrygians' (*HE* 6.20, 3).

Victor, the Bishop of Rome, and the Easter Controversy

A Struggle over Apostolic Hegemony

As if the growing Montanist challenge to Church authority was not enough, quickly spreading as it did throughout Asia Minor, Rome, and North Africa and possibly leaving offshoots in Phoenicia and Palestine as well,[48] the early part of the final decade of the second century was also the period in which a new — even if indirect — threat arose to challenge the apostolic status of the Jerusalem Church. It was then that Victor, the bishop of Rome, tried to impose upon the entire Christian Church ritual uniformity by setting the date of Easter on the Sunday following the fourteenth of Nisan, described by Eusebius as based on an apostolic tradition (ἐξ ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως).[49]

[48] That is what seems to emerge from the testimony of Celsus, as recorded in Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 7.3 (Origenes, *Contra Celsum*, 2nd edn, ed. by H. Chadwick (Cambridge, 1980), p. 402), and ibid., 9. But see Chadwick's note, ibid., to the effect that Celsus was not referring to the Montanists.

[49] Eusebius, *HE*, 5.23, 1. The entire dossier of documents concerning this episode can be found in Eusebius, *HE* 5.23–25 (pp. 488–98). Eusebius does not quote Victor himself, but only Polycrates of Ephesus, his opponent (ibid., 24, 2–8) and the latter's supporter, Irenaeus of Lyons (ibid., 24, 12–18; pp. 494–96). In order to understand the issue at stake here, a small digression on the contemporary state of affairs in the Church of Rome during the early part of the second century vis-à-vis the Easter celebrations is in order. This particular issue has been a source of much scholarly contention and though admittedly, its particulars lie outside the scope of this essay, it is nonetheless important to emphasize the following. It seems quite safe to assert, following N. Brox, 'Tendenzen und Parteilichkeiten im Osterfeststreit des zweiten Jahrhunderts', *ZKG*, 83 (1972), 291–324, W. Hüber, *Passa und Ostern: Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche* (Berlin, 1969), pp. 55–61, and M. Richard, 'La question paschale au II^e siècle', *L'Orient syrien*, 6 (1961), 179–212, and in part also S. G. Hall, 'The Origins of Easter', *Studia Patristica*, 15 (1984), 554–67, that until the days of Soter (*c.* 166 CE) the Roman Church did not celebrate Pascha at all, while the Roman communities of Asia Minor extraction celebrated it according to the Quartodeciman custom prevalent there (i.e., following the Jews' abstention from the unleavened bread as reflected in Polycrates' account, apud Eusebius). Soter of Rome, perhaps in the wake of the Laodicean Paschal dispute (around the same time), was thus the first to initiate the new custom of celebrating Easter Sunday. Victor of Rome (*c.* 190 CE) on the other hand, was the first to try to enforce the latter as the binding custom for all churches. (I hereby thank my friend, Dr. Clemens Leonard from Bonn, who is currently finishing a comprehensive and penetrating study of the Christian Paschal celebration and in particular on the emergence of Easter Sunday in the Christian Liturgy, for sharing with me his views and erudition on the above.)

The difficulty faced by Victor was the custom of Roman Christian congregations originally from Asia Minor and adjacent areas celebrating Easter on the same date as the Jewish Passover, which regardless of the day in the week fell on the fourteenth of Nisan.[50] This practice, based on historical and theological foundations, necessitated dependence on the Hebrew calendar, leading to those who practised it being nicknamed *Quartodecimanii* ('those of the fourteenth') was described by Eusebius in a rather diminutive manner as emanating from a 'more ancient tradition' (ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀρχαιοτέρας). It would be quite plausible to postulate that the Judaeo-Christians in Jerusalem's earlier community followed the Jewish date and thus at least in that respect sided with the Quartodecimans.[51] Furthermore, in the absence of any other local tradition, it might not be mistaken to assume that even Jerusalem's Gentile Christians continued to follow the local custom and to celebrate Easter on the

[50] The traditions and theology surrounding both the Quartodeciman custom as well as that of Easter Sunday are quite intricate, involving a wide array of issues. Suffice it to say that the Gospel discrepancy between the dates in John and synoptic Gospels was only one of the problems; the others concerned the moment of concluding the fast leading up to the celebrations and their duration, and more. Eusebius termed the tradition upon which the Christians of Asia Minor based themselves as being 'a most ancient tradition', while describing the opposing custom adopted by their opponents as being based upon 'the apostolic tradition'. Thus the use of the Hebrew calendar was also the result of a wish to preserve the specific date of Jesus's Passion, even though the conflicting traditions in the New Testament present two dates: 13–14, or 14–15 Nisan. This does not mean that adopting one of either Gospel dates determined the adherence to either of the customs. This would be a rather simplistic way of presenting the issue. On the early and complicated stages of the dispute, see Hall, 'Origins of Easter'. On the Quartodeciman celebration and its background, consult G. Rouwhorst, 'The Quartodeiman Passover and the Jewish Pesach', *QL*, 77 (1996), 152–73. The dependence on a Jewish calendar or calculation, however we define the matter — for no synchronized or accepted calendar existed then among the Jews especially among those sojourning in the Diaspora — has been demonstrated by Timothy C. G. Thornton, 'Problematical Passovers: Difficulties for Diaspora Jews and Early Christians in Determining Passover Dates during the First Three Centuries AD', *Studia Patristica*, 20 (1989), 402–08.

[51] As to the description of the Quartodeciman practice, see Eusebius, *HE*, 5.23, 1. There is no clear indication as to the Judaeo-Christian custom, though one could infer from the Judaeo-Christian text, the *Gospel of the Hebrews* cited by Jerome (*De viris illustribus*, 2), that James fasted for forty hours before he partook from the supper, thus creating a gap of time between the Passion and Resurrection.

date of the Jewish Passover, the fourteenth of Nisan, or maybe in some dependence on that date.[52]

At the core of Victor's demand for liturgical and ritual unity within the Christian Church, first and foremost in Rome, was the establishment of a monepiscopacy (which was to be realized only a generation later). If we are to assess the controversy on the basis of Victor's actions it is clear that he had far-reaching aspirations concerning the Church at large, namely, the creation of a universal church hierarchy by subordinating all local churches to the customs and decisions of Rome, 'the mother of the apostolic churches'. It would seem that what underlay Victor's demand was a new theologico-political outlook concerning the essence of the Church as a universal institution. For approximately until that time each individual congregation was seen to be a microcosm of the body of Jesus and the bishop heading it was accorded a superior local status.[53]

The great consequence of such a step and of possible future dictates from Rome was the loss of the unique status of the local 'apostolic heritage' and with it the local communal spiritual 'independence'. Irenaeus of Lyons, who was born

[52] As to our suggestion concerning the praxis of the Gentile Christian community it stands in disagreement with the assumption made by Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 3 vols (Paris, 1740), III, col. 150, and modern-day scholars who follow in his footsteps. They believe that with the end of Jewish-Christian hegemony in Jerusalem following the failure of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, and the rise of the 'Church of the Gentiles', the custom was modified and the date of Easter was set as the first Sunday after the fourteenth of Nisan. See, e.g., Richard, 'La question paschale'; Hüber, pp. 51–52, and more recently, E. Krentz, 'Caesarea and Early Christianity', in *Caesarea Papers: Staton's Tower, Herod's Harbour and Roman and Byzantine Caesarea,* ed. by R. Lindley Vann, JRA Supp. Ser., 5 (Ann Arbor, 1992), p. 264.

[53] As to Victor's role in the creation of the *monepiscopacy* in Rome which was achieved only in the days of Pontianus (*c.* 235 CE), see now A. Stewart-Sykes's introduction to his translation of and commentary on Hippolytus's *On The Apostolic Tradition* (Crestwood, NY, 2001), pp. 12–16 (with further bibliography). Until then the Christian congregations were seen as independent units, considered to be completely separate entities and not part of a universal body; see Twomey, p. 93. This does not mean that each congregation operated in complete independence from others, even in spiritual matters. However, there were attempts to ensure the independence of the local bishops. The ties between the congregations were sometimes presented as being a reflection of the relationship between God and His Son. For a short discussion, see H. Chadwick, 'The Role of the Christian Bishop in Ancient Society', in *The 35th Colloquium in Feb. 1979 of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies*, ed. by E. C. Hobbs and W. Wuellner (Berkeley, 1980), pp. 1–3. On the critical attitude toward Rome's claim to an apostolic pedigree, see Firmilianus's vehement epistle to Cyprian, *Ep.* 75.6, 1, ed. by G. F. Diercks, CCSL 3c (Turnhout, 1996), pp. 586–87.

and raised in Asia Minor, realized the implications of the heated dispute between Victor and Polycrates and though elsewhere he admitted the superiority of Rome, he vigorously advocated the validity of the local Asian apostolic traditions such as that of the Quartodecimanii. Using the precedent of Victor's predecessor's conduct toward dissident practices, he defended the latter's independent stand.[54]

Against this backdrop, then, the price of the effort by the Jerusalem 'Church of the Gentiles' to deny its historical past — even if it was not a conscious one — might have undermined its image as an apostolic church. Attempts to shore up the status of the Jerusalem Church toward the end of the second century are almost solely connected with the personality and efforts of Narcissus, the bishop of Jerusalem from the mid-eighties.[55] In these circumstances it is no surprise that Eusebius chose to bolster the image of the Palestinian Church in general and in particular that of Jerusalem and Caesarea, epitomized first and foremost in the exemplary spiritual leadership of the Jerusalemite bishop Narcissus, and later by that of Origen.

[54] For the primary expression of his outlook on this issue see Iranaeus, *Adversus haereses* 3.3, 2 (Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, ed. by W. W. Harvey, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1857), II, 10; English translation, Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd edn, 10 vols (Edinburgh, 1989–90), I, 415–16). However, scholars have difficulty in trying to interpret these passages. See L. Abramowski, 'Irenaeus, *Adversus Haer.* III. 3,2: Ecclesia Romana and Omnis Ecclesia, and ibid. 3,3: Anacletus of Rome', *JTS*, n.s. 28 (1977), 101–04; M. Donovan, 'Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship', *Second Century*, 4 (1984), 238–40. In an additional vague reference, which may have been connected with the controversy over the date of Easter, Irenaeus wrote: 'Anyone who causes a controversy of any sort within the church harms the unity of the body of Jesus' (ibid., 4.53, 1 (p. 261)). Irenaeus called for unity and agreement within the church, yet was prepared for a certain measure of independence in the preservation of the local apostolic traditions, the recognition of their validity, and the sanction of their practices. See, ibid., 4.53, 2 (pp. 262–63), and Eusebius, *HE* 5.24, 14–18.

[55] Setting the exact date of his appointment calls for a study which is outside the scope of our present discussion, this because there is a discrepancy between the dates noted by Eusebius in his account and lists in his *History* (*HE* 5.12; ibid., 22; 6.8–11) and the synchronic lists in his *Chronicon* in the Latin edition of Jerome (Eusebius–Hieronymus, *Chronicon* (ed. by R. Helm, *GCS*, 17 (Berlin, 1956), pp. 208–09), and also with the list of Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.20. Yet, at least on the basis of Eusebius, we can conclude that Narcissus began his activities as bishop, which consisted of two terms in office, around the mid-eighties of the second century, contra Lawlor and Ouolton, II, p. 168: 'before and after Eleutherus of Rome' (174–89), or Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, p. 51, that the first year of Narcissus's bishopric was 170.

Bishop Narcissus of Jerusalem

The Political-Ecclesiastical Portrait of Narcissus

About a decade divided two distinct periods in which the Jerusalem Church was led by Narcissus. The first began with his appointment during the eighties of the second century and continued to the end of that century.[56] The second period, one of joint leadership with his successor, Alexander, began late in the first decade of the next century and continued for a number of years.[57] According to the local succession lists reported by Eusebius, Narcissus was the thirtieth bishop of the Jerusalem Church in the line of succession that began with James. As we have already discussed earlier the nature of this list, all that remains is to point out the possible *raison d'être* of the composition of this list — in its entirety or in part — which could be attributed to Narcissus or to his close associates.[58]

According to Eusebius's account, Narcissus's first act was directly connected with what we have described above as Rome's attempt to undermine the status of the other 'apostolic churches'. The threat voiced by Victor, bishop of Rome, to excommunicate dissident churches (initially mainly in Asia) whose Easter liturgical rite did not match that of Rome, had its effect. Throughout the Christian world, including Palestine, regional church councils — the earliest we know of — were convened, in which all the details of the local 'apostolic tradition' were discussed and clarified.[59]

[56] This is what emerges from the account of Eusebius, *HE* 6.10, 1 (p. 540).

[57] It is difficult to ascertain the exact end of this period, about which there are several conflicting traditions, like in the case of his appointment. According to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, in the Latin version of Jerome (p. 213), he continued in office until 212. According to an anonymous tradition recorded by Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.20 (p. 47), Narcissus was still bishop during the rule of Alexander, the son of Mamaea, i.e., at least until the year 222. Most other traditions, however, corroborate what Eusebius wrote.

[58] See the discussion in my study, 'The Church of Jerusalem', pp. 87–89.

[59] For a partial summary of the controversies on this issue in the second century, see G. Fritz, 'Pâques, les controverses pascales', in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 39 vols (Paris, 1899–1968), XI, cols. 1948–51 (and the earlier literature cited there); see also Richard, 'La question paschale', and Hüber (for both, see note 49, above). See also Brox, 'Tendenzen und Parteilichkeiten', and in the collection of texts *Ostern in der Alten Kirche*, ed. by R. Cantalamessa (Bern, 1981; originally published in Italian in 1974).

One such council (or according to one source, two councils) was convened probably *c.* 198 by Narcissus of Jerusalem and Theophilus, bishop of Caesarea, the capital of the province of Palaestina.[60]

Up to this point we are on firm ground, but from here onward we face difficulties. What Eusebius relates about the decision of the Palestinian Church concerning the date of Easter is a cause for some doubt, especially in regard to his account of the position adopted by the Jerusalem Church. For Eusebius, who must have learned of the council's deliberations possibly from its memorandums (which he probably came across in the archives of Jerusalem or Caesarea) reported about them in what seems to be a rather inconsistent manner. Initially, as part of his presentation of the general problem that arose because of the custom practised in the churches of Asia Minor, he stated that in consequence many meetings and conferences were held in the different churches, including those in Palestine, in which a unanimous decision was reached that Easter should be celebrated only on the Sunday and that on that very same date the Paschal fast should end.[61] This presentation hardly accords with the spirit of Eusebius's description of the controversy and his dwelling in length on Irenaeus's stance defending the validity of the notion of variations in the 'apostolic heritage', and Eusebius's own insinuations to that effect — namely, condoning Irenaeus for his effort to maintain the spirit of peace (εἰρήνη) in the Church. However suggestive it might be to claim that Eusebius revised his narrative of the Quartodeciman dispute in light of the sweeping unanimity reached at Nicaea in favour of an Easter Sunday, it still leaves unexplained an important segment of the account, namely that of the local Palestinian Church's share in this heated controversy.

[60] Eusebius, *HE* 5.23, 1–4; 25 (pp. 488–90, 496–98). The institutional significance of the councils has been noted by E. Junod, 'Naissance de la pratique synodale et unité de l'église au II^e^ siècle', *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, 68 (1982), 176–80. For the councils that dealt with the issue of Easter, see J. A. Fischer, 'Die Synoden im Osterfeststreit des 2. Jahrhunderts', *AHC*, 8 (1976), 13–29, esp. 25–26. From Eusebius's account one may assume that there were two councils, very close in time — one presided over by Theophiles and the other by Narcissus.

[61] Eusebius, *HE* 5.23, 1–4 (pp. 488–90). Actually, a careful reading of what Eusebius wrote leads to the conclusion that this was not the exact spirit in which the heads of the Palestinian Church phrased their decisions. All that is written there is that the participants in the councils had no opposition to composing epistles in favour of accepting the proposed date, and furthermore: 'There is still extant a writing of those who were convened in Palestine, over whom presided Theophilus, bishop of the diocese of Caesarea, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem; and there is similarly another from those in Rome on the same controversy' (Eng. trans., I, 505).

For, following his lengthy description of the actions and demands of Victor and the sharp opposition raised by Irenaeus of Lyons, Eusebius returned once more to the Palestinian council (or councils) whose participants (including Cassius, the bishop of Tyre, and the bishop of Ptolemais) gave serious consideration to the local custom of Easter praxis 'which had come down to them from the succession of the apostles' (ἐκ διαδοχῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων). At the end of the account Eusebius quoted from the closing section of the above-mentioned writings, which the participants apparently sent off to an undisclosed addressee who could well have been Victor:

> Try to send copies of our letter to every diocese. [...] And we make it plain to you that in Alexandria also they celebrate the same day as we, for letters have been exchanged between them and us, so that we observe the holy day together and in agreement.[62]

This concluding passage is rather vague. For not only do we learn for the first time of the existence of a local Palestinian custom for dating Easter based on a long tradition, but also that it corresponded (or perhaps was altered in order to accord) with that celebrated in the Alexandrian Church. No hint is given as to the explicit date.

Eusebius's vague account gives rise to the question: Was Eusebius consistent in his report? That is, did his initial account juxtaposing the unanimous decision concerning celebrating the Easter on Sunday to his citation of the extent writings of those convened in Palestine mean that both items were one and the same, and therefore there was no need in the latter report concerning the Palestinian and Alexandrian custom to mention the bare facts again? Or could it have been an intentional blurring of the facts on Eusebius's part? The former possibility seems to me to be highly doubtful. The reason lies in the essence of the contention. Eusebius did not touch upon this volatile issue solely as an historian of past events, but primarily as a person involved in the unfolding history of his own time. The controversy over the date of Easter and its connection with the Jewish calendar, which peaked early during the days of Victor of Rome, continued to bog the mind of Church leaders in the following centuries, not in the least during Eusebius's own lifetime and later too, and was — as we well know — an inducement for the production of multiple Easter calculations and calendars. At the Council of Nicaea, for example, Constantine wished to turn this issue into a test case of 'ecclesiastical

[62] Eusebius, *HE* 5.25 (pp. 496–98). For the doubts raised here and for an attractive solution, see W. L. Petersen, 'Eusebius and the Paschal Controversy', in *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism* (see note 37, above), pp. 311–25, esp. 317–25.

unity'.[63] Following that council, Eusebius even volunteered his services to compile for the emperor an exposition on Easter and the significance of setting its date — a work which he completed around the year 335.[64]

Thus, it may be that Eusebius's account of this matter was double-edged and that he rotated back and forth between the ideal and reality. Even if, as claimed, Eusebius was — as can be gleaned from his treatment of Origen's image (Book VI) — a champion of minority opinions and might have on principle opposed Rome's despotism, on this one matter of Easter (even after the Nicaean resolution) he remained somewhat more ambivalent. On the one hand, he was outspoken concerning the ideal, namely, Church unity, but on the other, he did his best to conceal reality. Eusebius, who was — as is evident from his own work on Easter — an ardent anti-Quartodecimanian, believed that the tradition which Rome wished to impose throughout Christendom should have been the correct and desirable one, and therefore he intended to present the customs practised by some of the churches in Asia Minor as being erroneous. Yet, at the same time he (like Irenaeus) believed that an attempt to enforce ecumenical uniformity in liturgical matters was not fully justified.[65]

[63] This is proven by the lengthy section from Anatolius's treatise on how to calculate the date of Easter (Eusebius, *HE* 7.32, 14–19 (pp. 722–26)), which is an indication of the great interest taken by Eusebius in this issue. It is noteworthy that while Eusebius was engaged in composing the second (emended and expanded) version of his *Historia ecclesiastica* (313–14 CE), a church council convened at Arles, with the participation of Emperor Constantine, and decided that the setting of one universal date for Easter was an absolute necessity; see *Concilia Galliae* (*c.* 314), CCSL, 148 (Turnhout, 1963), pp. 4, 9. Later on the issue was repeatedly discussed at ecclesiastical councils beginning with the one held in Nicaea in 325 (see note 64, below). We have already discussed above the dependence of the Christian communities, especially in the diaspora and more so in Palestine, on the dating systems of Passover among the Jews; see Thornton.

[64] Concerning the impact the Easter problem had on the Nicaea Synod, see Eusebius, *Life of Constantine* 3.18–20, and the notes by the editors (Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, ed. and trans. by A. Cameron and S. G. Hall (Oxford, 1999), pp. 268–69). In this work (for which he was commended by the emperor, see *Life of Constantine* 4.35) Eusebius expressed sharp criticism of the continuing practice of linking the date of Easter to the fourteenth of Nisan, a custom which is not compatible with the chronology of events in Jesus's history or with the significance of Passover for the Jews. See Eusebius, *De solemnitate Paschalis*, nine fragments of this work have been preserved by Nicetas of Heraclea (PG, 24, col. 703).

[65] That would explain his lengthy quote from the epistle of Irenaeus to Victor; see however, Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, pp. 166–67, who proposes a somewhat different interpretation. Though to an extent our discussion so far follows Petersen's (see note 62, above)

That might be the reason for his obscure presentation of the earlier local Palestinian custom — one that was probably not consistent with the custom of the Church in Rome and which, in light of the present post-Nicaean circumstances, Eusebius actually intended somewhat to blur. The possible clue for a solution to the riddle lies in what the Palestinian document presented as a link between the churches of Jerusalem and Alexandria. That nexus, highlighted late in the second century, was far from being a theoretical one. Both churches were quite similar in their ancient apostolic legacies, as well as in the historical processes that had shaped them throughout the second century.[66]

The Judaeo-Christian heritage of the Alexandrian Church founded during the first century had some of its roots in the Jerusalem Church. The very presence of a conspicuous and organized Jewish populace in Alexandria determined, in more than one way, the local Church's existence. It may also be assumed that the great decline of the Egyptian Jewish community following the revolt of 115–17 CE was also the harbinger of a transition in the composition of the Christian community. Though, as recently contended, the Alexandrian Church was rather diverse from the beginning (with a substantial Gnostic presence) and its path to orthodoxy was rather slow, one is inclined to argue — though with uncertainty — for a lasting residual impact of its Jewish heritage. Thus, together with the ethnic changes that took place during the second century when the Gentile element became much more prominent, the influence of the Gentile Church at large increased, although it could be assumed that the Jewish-Christian influences did not entirely disappear, particularly in regard to customs. The Roman demand for liturgical uniformity did not overcome the natural need of those two churches to cling firmly to the ancestral heritage that linked them — the 'apostolic tradition' — which might have been in this case in essence Quartodeciman. This could be one explanation for the background to Eusebius's odd presentation of the issue.

The major piece of evidence supporting the above hypothesis lies in the surviving fragment of an epistle sent by Iranaeus to Alexandria, in which he censures the local Christians for not celebrating Easter on the Sunday after

basic assumptions and contentions, it deviates from it primarily by rejecting both the tone of East–West ecclesiastical tension advocated by Petersen as the source of Eusebius's inconsistencies, as well as the unfounded assumption concerning Eusebian sympathy with Quartodecimanism.

[66] See, primarily, Roberts, *Manuscript*, pp. 44–73, esp. 44–46. For a recent though partial endorsement of what follows, see J. C. Paget, 'Jews and Christians in Ancient Alexandria from the Ptolemies to Caracalla', in *Alexandria Real and Imagined*, ed. by A. Hirst and M. Silk (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 156–62.

Passover, thus perhaps vindicating the fact that Alexandrian practice was consistent with that of the Quartodecimans.[67] However, it may also be that Irenaeus's epistle preceded the exchange of letters between the churches of Palestine and Alexandria, in the wake of which the praxis of the Alexandrian Church underwent some change. In any case, there is nothing in the epistle that can directly enlighten us about the customs of the Church in Palestine, in general, and of that of Jerusalem, in particular.

There is yet another way of explaining this episode that seems to be even more plausible. As we have already noted,[68] it is highly doubtful whether we should accept the opinion of those who claim that immediately after the transformation of the Jerusalem Church into a Church of the Gentiles it changed its custom relating to the Easter celebration, and its Jewish-Christian practices were brought to an abrupt end.[69]

Though there is no solid evidence to support this assumption, there are a few hints that point in that direction:

(1) Many communities, in Rome as well as in Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria, continued to follow the Quartodecimanian custom even after the initial clash between Anicetus of Rome and Polycarp of Ephesus (*c.* 154 CE) which ended in harmony. It was only in the wake of the Council of Laodicea (166 CE), in which the issue was discussed, that the initial steps to curb this practice were taken in Rome.[70] This shows that the earliest seeds of the controversy raised by Victor during the nineties of the second century were sown only three or four decades earlier.

(2) Had Eusebius known that the Palestinian Church, and especially that of Jerusalem, had foregone the Quartodecimanian custom a generation earlier, he would not have concealed this fact from his readers.

[67] The epistle was published as an appendix to Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, ed. by Harvey, II, 456; see also 473–77 (Eng. trans. 568–69). See the comment made by Grant in his short review of M. Gödeche, *Geschichte als Mythos: Eusebs 'Kirchengeschichte'*, *JTS*, n.s. 39 (1988), 600. We shall return to this question.

[68] See note 52, above.

[69] See Hüber, pp. 51–52, who interprets the proclaimed nexus between the churches of Jerusalem and Alexandria as meaning that in both congregations Easter was celebrated on the Sunday following the fourteenth of Nisan. A similar view was expressed by A. Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders* (Berlin, 1977), p. 377.

[70] On Anicetus and Polycarp, see Eusebius, *HE,* 4.14; see also Fischer, 18–21; Hall, 'Origins of Easter', 260–61.

As for Narcissus's involvement in the events, I propose the following. Narcissus took advantage of the public controversy over the Easter issue and of the atmosphere of change that was emanating from Rome and other churches to introduce a radical transformation in liturgical matters, this in order to create a precedent and break away from the ancient controversial heritage. This move in turn was aimed to display a new image of an independent and self-confident Church of Jerusalem. Thus, the consensus reached between the churches of Palestine and Alexandria regarded the acceptance of the principle of an 'Easter Sunday' in the spirit of what Irenaeus wrote in his epistle. This again might well be the reason why Eusebius placed the latter act of Palestinian–Alexandrian concord, at least in the spirit of the Roman behest, right after the lengthy account of the role Irenaeus played in this episode and his attempt to defend the churches of Asia Minor from Victor's wrath. By presenting the atmosphere of agreement and acceptance Eusebius intended to show that the Palestinian Church came to this decision amicably, and not by the use of force or under the duress of a threat of excommunication by Victor. It would seem that Eusebius saw in this achievement, which entailed opposition to the stratagems of Rome and accorded with his own concepts mentioned above, also a clear manifestation of the influence of Narcissus and of the strength of his leadership. In this specific context, it even smacked of the spirit of apostolic leadership. Having said that, it should be stressed that the issue was far from resolved, for there still remained differences between the custom practised at Rome and the one practised in Palestine. Otherwise it would be difficult to square the following claim bluntly put by Firmilianus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia in the middle of the third century, that there was no foundation for the claims made by the bishops of Rome that they followed the 'apostolic tradition' in relation to Easter, because their practice differed from that of Jerusalem.[71]

In effect, it would seem that Theophilus of Caesarea, Narcissus of Jerusalem, and their colleagues in Alexandria essentially steered a middle way between the contesting positions. It should be stressed that in any case the step taken by Narcissus still demonstrated some dependence upon the Quartodeciman tradition and the Hebrew calendar, for until the formation of the Christian Easter calendars

[71] Cyprianus, *Epistulae* (see note 53, above), dated 256 CE, where he chooses to note explicitly the fact that the Romans, pretending to observe customs according to the apostolic tradition, do not celebrate *dies Paschae* (among other things) in the manner in which it is observed in Jerusalem.

in the course of the third century all Christians remained in some form or another dependent on the Jewish computations or empirically on their observance. Moreover, the final break with the Jewish Passover, at least in Alexandria, took place when the Equinox Rule was introduced (initially reported by Anatolius of Laodicea, *c.* 280 CE) and accepted according to which Easter was to be celebrated after the vernal equinox (in Alexandria, 21 March). At the same time, Jews continued to celebrate the Passover prior to the equinox. Until the days of Anatolius and Peter, not to mention the time of Victor, alterations in the Easter celebrations were minor and the Jewish custom, however erroneous, continued to have an impact on the Christian dating, as clearly discerned from Tricentius's appeal to Peter.[72]

The alignment between the Palestinian Church and that of Alexandria was, in my opinion, a step toward Rome's demand, but even more so its objective was to distance their customs from the Antiochian-based calendar. In Eusebius's historical narrative setting toward the end of Book V it carried yet further significance: it served as a prelude to the coming saga of the Alexandrian imprint on the Palestinian Church during the third century so well manifested in the portrayal of Origen's life in Book VI of the *History*.

As we have seen, Narcissus's firm step to sustain local tradition was taken together with Theophilus, the metropolitan bishop of Caesarea. The latter Church, which at this stage had yet made no claim to have sprung from apostolic roots, served in this episode as a partner — albeit an inferior one — to Jerusalem, contributing its political and administrative weight to the joint effort. This partnership of the two ecclesiastical centres was the first in a line of such joint efforts during most of the third century whose impact was felt beyond the borders of Palestine.

[72] See Thornton, p. 407. For Anatolius's criticism of the Jewish computation of the Pascha, see, Eusebius, *HE* 7.32, 14–20; for Peter's treatise on Easter, see PG, 18, cols. 512b–20b. Our analysis here was largely fashioned by the lengthy and suggestive discussion of the date of the Jewish Passover during late antiquity and its possible links to the computation of Christian calendars by S. Stern, *Calendar and Community: A History of the Jewish Calendar, Second Century BCE–Tenth Century CE* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 50–85, 223–26.

Narcissus's Political Clout

A firm political standing sometimes enables deviation from accepted norms, as the following episode will show. Toward the end of Narcissus's second period of leadership of the Jerusalem Church, when his advanced age made it difficult for him to perform his duties, a certain Alexander, who had been appointed a bishop in Cappadocia, arrived in the city to visit the holy places. Jerusalem's Christians, who knew of his firm stand during the oppressive rule of Septimius Severus, pleaded with him to take up residence in the city and jointly lead their congregation together with the incumbent bishop.[73]

A close and careful reading of the accounts of this episode (on whose hagiographical garb we shall dwell below) by Eusebius and Jerome shows that Alexander did not undergo any process of election.[74] He was elected, one could say, by divine providence. The direct involvement of the Jerusalem Christian congregation in the consummation of the 'heavenly election' seemed to have accorded with the public allotted role in similar procedures described by Hippolytus of Rome.[75]

In contrast, the fact that bishops in the region were prepared to entreat Alexander to remain in Jerusalem, as related by Eusebius,[76] and the presence of all the Palestinian bishops in the party welcoming Alexander, according to Jerome's account, serves to underline the passive role played by the Church establishment in this rather unusual case of ecclesiastical appointment. Indeed, the fact that he had already been elected as a bishop may have led to their marginal involvement; however, it is quite plausible that it was precisely the intent of the local tradition,

[73] Eusebius, *HE* 6.11, 1–2 (pp. 540–42).

[74] *De viris inlustribus* 62 (PL 23, col. 673). From Jerome's account one is led to believe that the news of Alexander's visit was revealed to Narcissus and his clergy and that in accordance with the prediction all the Palestinian bishops happened to convene in Jerusalem for what seems to have been a vote of confidence in the divine election. Cf. Socrates, *HE* 7.36 (ed. by G. Ch. Hansen, GCS, N.F. 1 (Berlin, 1995), pp. 384–85) who paraphrases Eusebius's account. Here, too, the central role played by the Jerusalem congregation is emphasized.

[75] Hippolytus Romanus, *Traditio apostolica* 1, 2, in *Didascalia et constitutiones apostolorum*, ed. by F. X. Funk (Paderborn, 1905), p. 107, on which see now the discussion by A. Stewart-Sykes in Hippolytus, *On the Apostolic Tradition*, English version, Introduction, and commentary by A. Stewart-Sykes (Crestwood, NY, 2001), pp. 56–60.

[76] Eusebius, *HE* 7.11, 2: 'And doing this [welcoming Alexander], with the common consent of the bishops who were administering the churches round about, they compelled him of necessity to remain'.

upon which Eusebius's account rested, to emphasize the supernatural aspect of Alexander's election — an aspect that was intended to bolster the hagiographic image of this tradition. It is doubtful whether this unusual transfer of Alexander, who was already serving as a bishop, from his see to Jerusalem would have been possible had it not been for the unique political and charismatic image of Narcissus.[77]

In these episodes, which we have concisely described, one can discern the earliest reported tinges of the Jerusalem Church's self-assertiveness. The unique spiritual and ecclesiastical posture of Narcissus was the direct outcome of his charismatic image, which to his contemporaries was to a great degree similar to that of the much-revered image of the first generation of Church leaders. This image slowly took shape by means of a series of hagiographic stories about him, disseminated most probably first and foremost by members of his congregation and possibly by the contemporary ecclesiastical establishment as well.[78]

The Hagiographic Image of Narcissus

It is doubtful whether Eusebius's collection of hagiographic traditions relating to Narcissus would have passed the criticism of modern-day scholars of Christian hagiography. This could be attributed to the fact that no customs connected with the veneration of saints developed round him — not at his burial site (which remains unknown) and not even in the church in which he served (he is not mentioned in the Jerusalem liturgical calendars, nor in those which they influenced). In short, and in Hippolyte Delehaye's language, there is no saintly 'dossier' under his name.[79] The fact that he died a natural death (and not as a martyr) may have been an impediment, even though some traditions date his period in office to the days of Maximianus's oppression of the Christians (*c.* 235). Indeed, in an Ethiopian book of saints he is noted as being a martyr.[80]

[77] In Eusebius's initial account of Alexander's election (*HE* 6.8, 7) he fails to mention the fact that Alexander was already serving as a bishop in Cappadocia. Centuries later, the Church historian Socrates regarded Alexander's transfer from Cappadocia to Jerusalem as a precedent; see J. R. McRay, 'Charismata in the Second Century', *Studia Patristica*, 12 (1975), 232–37.

[78] It would seem that the anecdotes about Narcissus collected by Eusebius were from oral stock, and he himself admits to have sifted through them to record only but a few; see *HE* 6.9, 1.

[79] See H. Delehaye, *The Legends of the Saints* (Notre Dame, IN, 1961), pp. 125–47.

[80] E. A. W. Budge, *The Book of Saints of the Ethiopian Church*, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1928), III, 662–63 (where his name is Barkissus).

His name has almost vanished from the ecclesiastical traditions. Most of what does appear in them repeats what Eusebius recorded.[81] He was, however, more extensively noted in later Latin works dating from the eighth and ninth centuries. By contrast, he is not mentioned at all in the early Greek hagiographic tradition.[82]

The stories about Narcissus in Eusebius's *History*, two of which will be dealt with in more detail below, were recorded as most probably received by Eusebius from those in the Jerusalem Christian community who disseminated them. However, as we have noted, Eusebius admits having chosen the traditions he included from among those he heard. They were those that were to serve his historiographic objectives. The way he presented the anecdotes discloses the special importance he attached to them. When he composed his 'vita' of Narcissus he was careful to differentiate between the political and charismatic images of his hero. These were not chronological considerations alone that led him to separate the role of Narcissus in the Easter controversy, in Book V, from Narcissus the miracle worker in Book VI.[83] One should bear in mind that most of Book VI is devoted to the biography of Origen — a hero who was especially dear to the spiritual world of Eusebius and of his mentor, Pamphilus. It was written in the form of a 'life of a saint' and included many polemical sections, as well as biographies of charismatic pagan figures.[84] Into this narrative framework Eusebius deemed it right to add the biography of Narcissus, taking care not to mar in the process the image of its main protagonist, Origen.

The series of anecdotal episodes that centres round Narcissus was recorded by Eusebius in a single literary unit.[85] The order is chronological, at least in the second

[81] Apart from the sources cited in note 82, below, he is mentioned in the *Annals* of Eutichus of Alexandria (with a chronological error; PG, 111, col. 994) and Nicephorus Callistus, *HE* 6.19 (PG, 145, col. 1028).

[82] Narcissus does not appear at all in the works listed in the *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca.* The later Latin sources are Adhelmo, *De laude virginis* 21 (PL, 89, cols. 254–55), and Flodoardus de Reims, *De triumphis Christi sanctorumque Palaestinae* 1.23 (PL, 135, cols. 505–08).

[83] According to the chronology in Eusebius's *HE*, the Easter controversy belongs to Narcissus's first period of leadership in the Jerusalem Church, from *c.* 185 to 200.

[84] Book VI is an abridgement of the *Apology for Origen* jointly authored by Pamphilus Martyr and Eusebius. See the extensive discussion in R. M. Grant, 'Eusebius and his Lives of Origen', in *Forma Futuri: Studi in onore del Cardinale M. Pellegrino* (Torino, 1975), pp. 635–49. For this genre in general, see P. Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man* (Berkeley, 1983).

[85] Eusebius, *HE* 6.9–11, 3 (pp. 538–42).

and third stories — giving them the character of a logical historical development. Placing the first story at the head of this series, even if it is lacking the chronological link, is highly compatible with this historical development which presents Narcissus from the moment of the first contact with his congregation until his final days, with the episode of his retreat to the desert for a period of 'philosophical life' located in between.[86] We have, thus, three episodes, two of which are believed to have important bearing on the new image of the Jerusalem Church we shall discuss in detail.

The Miracle of the Oil and Water

> Once at the great all-night vigil of the Pascha it is said that the oil failed the deacons, and that when deep despondency seized the whole multitude, thereupon Narcissus commanded those who were preparing the lights to draw water and bring it to him; that when this was no sooner said than done, he then prayed over the water, and bade them pour it down into the lamps with unfeigned faith in the Lord. And that when they did this, contrary to all reason by miraculous and divine power its nature was changed in quality from water into oil; and that for a very long time, from that day even to ours, a little was preserved as a proof of that wonder of former days by very many of the brethren there.[87]

Eusebius saw fit to record this story, first and foremost, because the 'holy relic' (the little that remained of the oil) was in the possession of the Jerusalem congregation.[88]

As for this miracle itself, we may say that it belongs to the category of 'quality miracles', that is, not the chasing out of demons or acts of miraculous healing but a case of transforming nature. The typological-historical analogy that immediately comes to mind is the famous miracle performed by Jesus during his youth, when

[86] Eusebius, *HE* 9.4–8, Story B: the controversy with the members of the congregation and his withdrawal to a life of asceticism; followed by 10.1–11, 3, Story C: his return and reappointment as bishop and the 'miraculous' joining of Alexander of Cappadocia to the local ecclesiastical leadership. 9.1–3 is Story A: the miracle of the oil and the water.

[87] Eusebius, *HE* 6.9, 1–3 (p. 538; Eng. trans., II, 33). Eusebius chose this miracle from among a few that were told about Narcissus, as he himself notes in the opening sentences of this section. Neither he, nor his informants, stated where the miracle took place.

[88] P. Brown, *The Cult of the Saints* (Chicago, 1981), p. 78. In this case, the oil that was preserved was a relic of a local miracle that was connected more with the local Church than with the person with whose name it was linked.

he transformed water into wine at a wedding feast at Cana in Galilee.[89] Then, as now, the miracle was the first of the person's saintly acts, which is the reason for placing it at the beginning of the series of episodes. But the story of the miracle performed by Narcissus was different, for he was only an intermediary who attributed the miracle to two elements: prayer and unfeigned faith, a notion akin to miracle stories found also in contemporary Jewish sources.[90]

Obviously, Narcissus did not see himself as being like Jesus, but miracles of this kind are some indication of the nature and power of those involved. In the eyes of those who spread the tradition, Narcissus's image as a wonder worker carried with it the marks of an earlier mythic like age — the apostolic period.

A Voice from Heaven: The Appointment of Alexander of Cappadocia as Bishop of Jerusalem

In line with Eusebius's pattern of thought, this anecdote (whose institutional dimensions have been discussed above) was the direct justification for the entire series of stories, but according to its chronology it belongs to the twilight period of Narcissus's leadership of the Jerusalem Church.

> And when he [Narcissus] was no longer able to perform the ministry on account of ripe old age, the above-mentioned Alexander, being bishop of another community, was called by a dispensation of God to a joint ministry with Narcissus, by a revelation which appeared to him in a vision at night. Whereupon, as if in obedience to some oracle, he made the journey from the land of the Cappadocians, where he was first deemed worthy of the episcopate, to Jerusalem, for the purpose of prayer and investigation of the [sacred] places. The people there gave him the most cordial welcome, and suffered him not to return home again, in accordance with another revelation which was seen by them also at night, and which vouchsafed an identical utterance of the clearest kind. [...] For it indicated to them to go forth outside the gates and welcome as their bishop him who was fore-ordained of God. And doing this, with the common consent of the bishops who were administering the churches round about, they compelled him of necessity to remain.[91]

[89] John 2. 1–12. This miracle and its Dionysian elements have been discussed by H. van der Loos, *The Miracles of Jesus* (Leiden, 1965), pp. 613–15.

[90] A possible parallel to this story is the famous miracle in which vinegar was turned into oil related about the charismatic righteous man, the rabbinic sage Ḥanina b. Dosa, as reported in BT Ta'anith 25a.

[91] Eusebius, *HE* 6.11, 1–2 (pp. 540–42; Eng. trans., II, 37).

A careful reading of this story reveals two separate levels of editing. The first is comprised of two fragments of an etiologic tale — the vision of Alexander, matched by the vision experienced by the members of the Jerusalem congregation. The purpose of both fragments is to explain why Alexander of Cappadocia became the leader of the Church of Jerusalem (later to be named as Alexander of Jerusalem). This is further substantiated when we read the testimony of the fifth-century Christian historiographer Socrates, who informs us (in the name of Eusebius) that when Alexander came to Jerusalem he was already serving as a bishop in Cappadocia. Socrates put special emphasis on this precedent of a bishop being transferred from one see to another. [92] On another level, between the two etiological fragments, Eusebius weaved in a more earthly anecdote about the circumstances of Alexander's coming to Jerusalem.

The editing of the two fragments is rather crude. Two clues support this assumption. First of all, according to the initial part of the story, Alexander did not come to Jerusalem to fulfil a heavenly vision, but for a pilgrimage, then still a novel custom. Was this additional component meant simply to place greater emphasis on the vision seen by the Jerusalem Christians? Secondly, the enthusiastic reception of Alexander upon his arrival in Jerusalem, according to the middle section of this anecdote, was rather modest compared with the homage paid to him in the description that follows. Whereas the earlier part of the narrative was compatible with Alexander's reputation as a confessor and may have been the reason why the members of the congregation pleaded with him to stay, the latter part was complementary to the vision that preceded it, and the manner in which Alexander's reception was in the fashion of the *adventus* ceremonies in the Roman-Byzantine world. It is this section of the narrative with its symbolism that we must deal with.[93]

Though it is difficult to point to an exact parallel to this anecdote — one may point to similarities in some OT parallels[94] — it would be better to postulate an analogous-symbolic framework in the historical reality that was much closer in time

[92] See notes 74–76, above.

[93] For such ceremonies in the later Roman and the Byzantine periods, see S. G. MacCormack, 'Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: The Ceremony of Adventus', *Historia*, 21 (1972), 712–52.

[94] Gen. 15. 1–2, or other biblical 'call stories' such as those of Elijah and Elisha, 1 Kings 19. 19–21, which are not direct parallels but include some similar central elements.

to the Jerusalem Christians, that is, the apostolic period. The key element in this distinctive story is Alexander's unique appointment through a heavenly call. Again, as in the previous episode the atmosphere and image of an archaic age in the history of the Jerusalem Church, the age of the apostles, is imprinted on the story.[95] The direct lesson which was to be imparted was the reminder that in that very same Church there existed in a past age heavenly guided election procedures, and that these traditions were no doubt to be reflected on as local signs of spiritual championship.

However, the episode of Alexander may have had yet another symbolical political aspect in the wider sense. That a person who had been chosen as a bishop, adored as a confessor, and ended up as a martyr, migrated from Asia Minor, the centre of Montanism, to Jerusalem — and this as the result of a vision — was for Jerusalem's Christians a clear sign of their city's supremacy, at least over Pepuza, the 'Jerusalem of Phrygia'. All the elements of this hagiographic tradition could well serve the Jerusalem Church in its efforts to reconstruct its historical image, but above all in its struggle against the Montanist concept concerning the existence of a 'new' Jerusalem, be it an earthly or a heavenly one.

As noted, in between these two anecdotes — the one dating from the beginning and the other from the end of Narcissus's activity in Jerusalem — a third story was inserted, intended to explain his absence from the local leadership at the beginning of the third century for a period of almost ten years.[96] The story itself, despite the fact that it is permeated with symbolism, which merits a special study that is outside the scope of our present study, deserves nonetheless a terse review because it contains some elements pertaining to the spiritual image of Narcissus.

Some of his congregants believed Narcissus to have been overly strict, and against this backdrop a libel was spread against him that forced him to retreat into seclusion somewhere, perhaps in the Judaean desert.[97] According to a local

[95] Jesus's appearance before his disciples after the Crucifixion and his words to Peter, 'Feed my sheep' (John 21. 17), or his appearance to Paul on the way to Damascus followed by Paul's appointment there by Ananias by the laying on of hands (Acts 9. 3–9), or the Jewish-Christian tradition about Jesus appearing in a vision to James, Peter, and John.

[96] Fox, pp. 508–09, claims that the appearance on the scene of Alexander and the other miraculous events were intended to cover up the tension within the Jerusalem Church, tension that was the cause of Narcissus's going into seclusion — an event that was presented as being a voluntary act for the purpose of adopting the lifestyle of a philosopher.

[97] Eusebius, *HE* 6.9, 4–8 (pp. 538–40). It is possible to postulate that the rumors were spread in the aftermath of the Paschal controversy by those opposed to the ritual policy

tradition, he maintained 'the lifestyle of a philosopher' (φιλονσοφον βιον, the meaning of which was clearly described in the biography of Origen by Eusebius and Pamphilus),[98] as he had wished to do for some time, and those who libelled him — a small minority in the congregation — were punished by Heaven. Shortly after the demonstration of the Divine retribution, Narcissus returned to Jerusalem, was reappointed bishop, and Gordius — his replacement — as deposed from the priesthood.

The central element in this story, of course, is Narcissus's withdrawal from the leadership of his congregation for a life of asceticism in the desert. By adding this detail to the biography of Narcissus, Eusebius completed the work of shaping his unique spiritual image as a 'saint' by combining asceticism, holiness, and charisma in one and the same person. No wonder, then, that this became a model deemed worthy of emulation. There was yet another aspect to Narcissus's retreat to the desert — his ripe old age of 116. It was not in vain that Alexander noted this fact in his epistle to the congregation of Antionë (in Egypt), later spotted by Eusebius in the archives of the Jerusalem Church and incorporated into his narrative.

At a time when advanced age (which bridged the gap over dimly remembered periods of time) was not common, it had yet an additional value, serving as a chronological bridge between the apostolic age and the present one. It thus enhanced the idea that the bishop was both the direct continuator of the apostles as well as the inheritor of the true tradition that originated in the Holy Spirit with which he was invested.[99]

In Narcissus's case advanced age was more than a mere biological fact. It enabled one to envisage in his mind how Narcissus could theoretically have been the direct successor of Simeon son of Clopas as leader of the Jerusalem Church who

adopted by Narcissus.

[98] It seems that Narcissus was the first ascetic hermit in the history of Christian monasticism, even if his withdrawal to the desert did not necessarily result from the fact that he had been hurt by the criticism levelled at him, as is believed by Dodds (E. R. Dodds, *Christian and Pagan in Age of Anxiety* (Cambridge, 1965), p. 33).

[99] According to the years of his lifetime, Narcissus was active very near in time to another heroic figure in the history of the Church, who — according to the testimony of some — had come into direct contact with the apostles. This was Polycarpus, the martyr from Smyrna. About him see Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 3.3, 4 (II, 12); Eusebius, *HE* 3.36, 1 (p. 274).

succeeded James the founder of the Holy See of Jerusalem.[100] At the same time it impressed upon the reader that Narcissus was indeed the real new Gentile Christian founding figure of the local Church. It also propagated the image that Narcissus and Alexander, the new founders, were actually exact parallels of James and Simeon, the ancestral founders of the Jerusalem dynasty. In both instances one encountered saints, leaders enjoying the Divine auspices, and martyrs, though in the latter example the element of family succession was lacking. All this in turn helped to create the impression that the Church of the Gentiles was the legitimate spiritual heir of the Church of the Circumcision. This pattern could fill a twofold function: to lessen tensions within the community, and also to bolster the image of the Jerusalem Church as one worthy of its historical status.

Once the Jerusalem Church had shaped its self-image and also taken steps to underpin its public image, the way was now open for it to give this image practical expression and transform itself into an influential Church centre. Indeed, the annals of this Church in the third century, as recorded in Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica*, deal almost entirely with this aspect of its history. Upon the initiative of Narcissus's successors, Clement of Alexandria (who took up residence in Jerusalem late in his life) and Alexander of Cappadocia (who was appointed bishop of Jerusalem), a library and an archive were established in the city, among whose holdings were epistles and other diverse documents that Eusebius consulted in order to write his Church history.[101]

[100] Bearing all this in mind, it now becomes clear why shaping and adjusting the lists of bishops has been attributed to Narcissus and his supporters. The lists were but one more component in the effort to create the new local image. The purpose of the artificial symmetry created between the lists of the 'circumcised' bishops and their 'Gentile' counterparts was to emphasize that a new era had begun in the Jerusalem Church.

[101] Eusebius, *HE* 6.20, 1 (p. 566). For the establishment of the library and Eusebius's testimony as to the use he made of it see 6.20, 2 (p. 566), where he give us an indication of its contents. Hesychius, a fifth-century Jerusalem presbyter, informs us that this library, established several decades before that of Caesarea, was known as 'the Library of the Anastasis' (PG, 93, col. 1560). For more details on the libraries of Caesarea and Jerusalem, consult Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven, 1995), pp. 154–61.

The Third Century — A Tale of Two Cities

The Rise of the Caesarean Church: A Shift in Local Power and Imagery

It was during the term in office of Alexander that the influence of the Jerusalem Church somewhat decreased, though it most probably continued to enhance the aura of its apostolic age as well as continue to share its local Palestinian ecclesiological duties side by side with the ascending Caesarean metropolitan church. However, the impression one gains from Eusebius's accounts is that as of the second third of the third century the Jerusalem see sinks into the background of the local institutional scene, and from thence continues to flourish more in the shadow of the newly thriving centre on the Mediterranean coast.

Eusebius's narrative in the sixth book of his *History* indeed marks the turning point in the unfolding history of the Palestinian Church.[102] From then on the see of Caesarea is placed in the centre of the local Christian arena. From a close reading of the early chapters of Origen's biography in Eusebius's *History*, one cannot escape the impression that Eusebius wanted to emphasize the age of transition in the Palestinian Church. He achieved this by juxtaposing Narcissus's outstanding hagiographic biography, permeated with miracles and saintly demeanour, and that of Origen's scholarly and ascetic life.[103] In between the two he inserted some details about Alexander of Jerusalem's intellectual world and contacts with Alexandrian teachers such as Clement, presenting Alexander as a sort of a bridge between the two worlds of Christian leadership.[104] With all the constraints of chronology, the

[102] Eusebius devoted the sixth and seventh books of his work to the period beginning with the first days of Alexander as bishop (212) until the eve of the great persecutions in the nineties of the third century. In this account, there is a gradual decline in the mention of the Church in Jerusalem, matched by the more central part played by that of Caesarea. The basic elements comprising the image of Caesarea were its increasing importance as a centre of study and theology, especially due to the efforts of Origen, and the frequent cases of martyrdom connected with that church. See Eusebius, *HE* 6.30–32 (pp. 584–88); 7.12–15 (pp. 664–70).

[103] It is not that Origen did not enjoy the good tidings of divine providence, rather the opposite was true. As he portrays Origen's childhood and early years in Alexandria, Eusebius emphasizes time and again how God intervened on his behalf and saved him. However, as aptly put by Patricia Cox, he saw in these instances of Origen's life, snippets so to say, for a divine man's biography: 'situations that disclose the meaningful direction of history by providence'; see her insightful discussion of the place of the miraculous in the world of Eusebius's biographical writing, Cox, pp. 69–101, esp. 73–80. For the theological aspects of this issue see note 104, below.

[104] Eusebius, *HE* 6.8–19. It might well be that lurking behind this presentation in

atmosphere imparted by this juxtaposition was that of a new age, an age that underwent a sort of transformation from revealed truth to reason. On the local level, it was as if Eusebius became more than aware of the innate characteristics of a power struggle between these two cities and sees.[105]

The change, as mentioned above, came about with the appearance of Origen the Alexandrian sage[106] at the gates of the luxuriant, ethnically mixed town on the shores of the Mediterranean with its estimated seventy thousand inhabitants.[107]

Eusebius's narrative lay also the conviction that the use of miracles in the promotion of Christianity was some sort of 'liability', because of its controversial import. For the notion of miracles and their use was being increasingly drawn, during the third century, into the heart of the Pagan-Christian polemic, as seen from the writings of Origen and later those of Eusebius. The effort put in by Origen, as well as by Eusebius, to combat the rival arguments laid down by Celsus, Porphyry, and others was immense; see the comprehensive discussion in A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against Paganism* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 165–214. On a more general footing, miracles were becoming a thing of the past as a new spiritual climate was setting in; see J. den Boeft, 'Miracles Recalling the Apostolic Age', in *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought*, ed. by A. Hilhorst (Leiden, 2004), pp. 51–62, esp. p. 57.

[105] A notion advanced for entirely different reasons in contemporary rabbinic thought; cf. BT Megillah, 6a, on the rivalry between Caesarea (Rome) and Jerusalem.

[106] See Grant, 'Eusebius and His Lives of Origen', pp. 635–49, who tends to see in Eusebius's portrayal of Origen in the sixth book of his *History* an attempt to describe him according to the conventions of the Greek — θεῖος ἀνήρ. On the genre and the narrative setting of Eusebius's account, see again, Cox. Apart from the composition of Origen's biography by Eusebius, another more comprehensive account on Origen and his world of thought in the manner of an *Apology* was composed earlier by Eusebius and his mentor — and Origen's disciple — Pamphilus while the latter was in custody before being martyred in 309 CE. The treatise, comprising six books of which only one survived, was essentially an apology pro-Origenes (in reply to his critics). It has come down to us in Rufinus's Latin translation; see now the new edition of the *Apology* (with a French translation, Introduction, and notes) by R. Amacker and E. Junod, SC, 464–65 (Paris, 2002). On this work see the detailed discussion by P. Nautin, *Origène: Sa vie et son œuvre* (Paris, 1977), pp. 134–53. For a recent and concise account of Origen's biography, see R. Williams's entry 'Origenes/ Origenismus', *TRE*, (Berlin, 1995), xxv, 397–403.

[107] Much has been written in recent decades on late Roman Caesarea and its ethnic and religious matrix. See, for instance, Lee I. Levine, *Caesarea under the Roman Rule* (Leiden, 1975), pp. 113–31 (on the Christian community); G. Downey, 'Caesarea and the Christian Church', in *The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima*, I: *Studies in the History of Caesarea Maritima*, ed. by Charles T. Fritsch and others (Missoula, 1975), pp. 23–42 (the Christian community); Krentz, pp. 261–67, and above all the many aspects discussed in the collection of essays, *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia,* ed. by A. Raban and K. G. Holum (Leiden, 1992). For an updated archaeological survey of late Roman Caesarea with ample

Origen, who initially visited Caesarea *c.* 215 and made this city his final place of sojourn after fleeing Alexandria from the fury of Demetrius the local bishop *c.* 232, was the Christian sage who transformed Caesarea.[108] And though this is a well-known and amply studied and documented chapter in the history of the local Church, some important facets of this transformation do deserve mention. Origen created in Caesarea a thriving intellectual centre. The centre of learning founded by Origen, of which traces have not yet been found in the vast excavations, has been assumed to comprise of a vast library, which later in the century was much expanded by Origen's disciple Pamphilus. Pamphilus's actions and achievements were later described by Jerome as resembling those of Demetrius of Phaleron, the legendary librarian of the Alexandrian Ptolemaic Library.[109] Within the close quarters of that library Origen might have also finalized his great enterprise — a critical synoptic edition in six columns of the Bible and its various Greek translations known as the Hexapla, which he had already carried out to a great extent in Alexandria.[110] Origen's learning centre attracted local and overseas students, pagans and Christians alike, among them distinguished scholars and bishops such as Alexander of Jerusalem and Firmilianus of Cappadocia.[111] By far the most famous among the foreigners was Gregory Thaumaturgus, who left to

bibliography, see J. Patrich, 'Urban Space in Caesarea Maritima, Israel', in *Urban Centers and Rural Contexts,* ed. by J. W. Eadie and T. Burns (East Lansing, MI, 2001), pp. 77–110. On pagan Caesarea and its cults during the period leading to the mid-third century, see recently Belayche, pp. 171–99.

[108] On this episode, see Eusebius *HE* 6.8, and Joseph W. Trigg, *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third- century Church* (London, 1985), pp. 230–40; R. P. C. Hanson, 'Was Origen Banished from Alexandria?' *Studia Patrtistica*, 17, no. 2 (1982), 904–07.

[109] Jerome, *Ep*. 34.1 (ad Marcellam). The content of Origen's library and its diversity have been recently surmised from the list of treatises mentioned or alluded to in his vast literary output; see A. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 8–10. For more on Pamphilus's Caesarean library, see A. Kofsky, 'Pamphilus and the Library at Caesarea', *Cathedra* (forthcoming, in Hebrew).

[110] In carrying out this great task Origen might have resorted to the help of assistants. Could there have been among them copyists such as his friend Ambrose, who was converted by Origen and later became his patron (Eusebius, *HE* 6.23)? It is quite possible that this mode of assistance was sustained by Ambrose following Origen's relocation in Caesarea. Eusebius reports that when he reached the age of sixty, toward the end of his life he 'permitted shorthand-writers to take down the discourses [διαλεξεις] delivered by him in public, a thing that he had never before allowed' (*HE* 6.36, 1). On the significance of this act by Origen, see the discussion by H. Crouzel, *Origen* (San Francisco, 1985), pp. 29–30

[111] Eusebius, *HE* 6.27.

posterity a description of the local curriculum and methods of learning.[112] Having said that, the exact nature of Origen's teaching centre has yet to be determined. Some scholars are of the opinion that it cannot be classified as a catechetical school like the one Origen led in Alexandria, but should be seen more as a centre of learning in which philosophical and scriptural knowledge is imparted to pagans and Christians alike; others have described the activity there as comprising merely that of a circle of pupils surrounding a master.[113]

Most of Origen's exegetical, homiletic, and apologetic works were produced in Caesarea[114] and with them his fame increased, resulting in him being summoned to take part in encounters in Arabia (with the local governor and dissident bishops), and others gathered under the auspices of the royal matrons of the Severan House, such as Julia Mamaea. Later he became engaged in an exchange of letters with the emperor himself and his wife (Philip the Arabian and Severa).[115] Origen's vast and penetrating biblical exegesis, based on his Alexandrian schooling and the methodological tools he developed and propagated in — among other treatises — his *On the First Principles,* had most probably attracted rabbinic interest and response, thus turning Caesarea into a centre of Christian-Jewish polemics.[116] At the same time this intellectual activity

[112] See recently, in short, A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, pp. 12–13, and note 113, below.

[113] Carriker, *Library of Eusebius*, pp. 6–7, and nn. 19–20. H. Lapin has opted for the latter, arguing that all we can deduce from our main source of information, Gregory Thaumaturgos's *Address of Thanks*, is that the 'Caesarean Christian "schools" consisted of disciple circles gathered round a particular master (the best known of whom was Origen)', and not an educational system with a set curriculum. See his, 'Jewish and Christian Academies in Roman Palestine: Some Preliminary Observations', in *Caesarea Maritima* (see note 107, above), p. 500; for more on the comparison between the local rabbinic and Christian institutions, see ibid., pp. 496–512.

[114] See Crouzel, pp. 37–49, and now Williams, 'Origenes/ Origenismus', pp. 403–06, with ample bibliography on p. 418.

[115] Eusebius, *HE* 6.19, 15; ibid., 33; 37 (Arabia); 33, 4 (Greece); 21, 3 (Julia Mamaea). On Julia Mamaea's and similar cultural circles, see E. J. Hemelrijk, *Matrona Docta: Educated Women in the Roman Elite from Cornelia to Julia Domna* (London, 1999), pp. 122–28, at 127; Eusebius, *HE* 6.36, 3.

[116] It is doubtful whether Origen knew Hebrew, though he refers twice early in his Alexandrian days to his Jewish teacher (*On the First Principles*, 1.3, 4 and 4 [in the Latin version]); see, however, Crouzel, p. 12, who claims that from the content of Origen's remark it would seem that the teacher was a Jewish-Christian. Concerning Origen's encounters with rabbis in Caesarea, see N. de Lange's pioneering study, *Origen and the Jews* (Cambridge, 1976); P. M. Blowers, 'Origen, the Rabbis, and the Bible: Towards a Picture of Judaism and

rapidly transformed Caesarea also into a centre of dominating influence in theology, as well as in internal Church controversies. All these no doubt asserted the image of the local Caesarean see, which meant additional political, theological, and ecclesiastical clout within the Christian Palestinian arena and in the surrounding regions.

The support Origen received from the bishops of Jerusalem and Caesarea in his personal conflict with Demetrius, the tyrannical leader of the Alexandrian Church, most probably induced him to assist his benefactors, Theoctistus and Alexander, in their struggles against heretics and heretical movements. This impressive chapter in local ecclesiastical assertive power deserves a closer look.

At their behest Origen made three visits to the area east of the Jordan River between 244 and *c.* 248. On these journeys he conducted public disputations with the leaders of the local Christian communities, whose heretical doctrines were an abomination to those who had sent him on the missions.[117] According to Eusebius's account, which is supported by a detailed report of one of these disputations that was discovered in a papyrus from Tura in Egypt, Origen combated heretical views voiced by Beryllus of Bostra and Heraclides (= Dialogue in the papyrus) that carried some sort of leanings towards 'monotheistic' views.[118]

Christianity in Third Century Palestine', in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*, ed. by C. Kannengiesser and W. L. Petersen (Notre Dame, IN, 1986), pp. 96–116. On the rabbinic polemic against Origen's scriptural interpretations, see the important studies by Ephraim Urbach and Reuven Kimelman cited by Blowers (ibid., p. 112, n. 78). See too M. Hirshman, *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity* (Albany, 1996), pp. 83–94. For the ongoing scholarly debate on whether early Christian polemic with the Jews was real or imagined, that is, was it an offshoot of the greater pagan–Christian polemic, see recently J. C. Paget, 'Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity', *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum*, 1 (1997), 195–225.

[117] For Origen's journeys see Eusebius, *HE* 6.33, 1–2 (p. 588); 6.37 (p. 592).

[118] This papyrus, discovered in 1941 at Tura in Egypt, includes a 'dialogue between Origen and Heraclidus and the bishops who accompanied him' on 'the Father, the Son, and the soul'; it was first published in Cairo in 1949 by J. Scherer and has since been the subject of several editions and studies; see J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Paris, 1976), p. 243 (no. 638). Eusebius, *HE,* ibid.; Eusebius records that Beryllus's correspondence and writings (perhaps among them the record of his discussion with Origen too) were preserved in the library of Aeila formed by Alexander, ibid. 20.2. Eusebius mentions yet another public discussion in Arabia on matters of faith attended by Origen, ibid., 37. The importance of this work lies in its widespread popularity among the Christian communities, and in that its influence was fairly quickly felt in hermeneutic works as early as the fourth century. The tenets of Beryllus, teachings that Eusebius described as 'negating the principles

Having said that, we should bear in mind that Origen held pagan cult and thought to be the real opponents of rising Christianity.[119] His greatest opportunity to combat the pagan anti-Christian views came when he set out to refute Celsus's treatise. The *Contra Celsum* — Origen's last treatise composed in 248–49 — turned out also to be his most famous of all. It was an apologetic reply to a major attack on Christianity written about seventy years earlier by a pagan philosopher named Celsus who gave his work the title *The True Logos.*[120] Among the accusations Celsus brought against the Christians was that they refrained from participating in civil and imperial cults, to which Origen, though uncompromising in as far as Christian compliance with that demand went, was nonetheless willing to agree that the empire did play a positive role in God's *oikonomia.*[121] Could he have known at the time that about two years later the issue of the imperial cult would play a major role in the instigation of the most severe persecutions of the Christians yet mounted by pagan Rome?[122] In the course of those dark days under the rule of Emperor Decius (249–51), Origen, along with other leading figures in the Palestinian Church such

of the faith', were to a great extent a return to monarchic-dynamic concepts of the second century. The ideas presented by Heraclidus might have been adopted from Jewish or Jewish-Christian circles active in and around the Christian communities in Arabia. Origen's involvement in such disputations was not at his own initiative, just as it is doubtful whether the bishops in Arabia would have been willing to conduct a public confrontation with him were it not for the agreement of an ecclesiastical leadership which they deemed to be authoritative. The term summoned, which Eusebius uses in relation to Origen, better translated as they implored him (to come), does not necessarily refer to an invitation from the bishops of Transjordan, but to one coming from an authoritative body recognized by all. It was the leadership of the Palestinian Church (the sees of Caesarea and Jerusalem) that was most probably behind sending Origen to fight the heretical sects in Transjordan. See Nautin, p. 388. For more on these anecdotes see ibid., pp. 387–89, and Crouzel, pp. 31–33.

[119] On which, see H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 95–123.

[120] On the circumstances of Origen's reply and a short summary of the main issues under discussion see recently, Trigg, pp. 52–61.

[121] Trigg, p. 55. For Christian utter rejection of emperor worship see *Contra Celsum,* 8.65 and H. Chadwick's noted ad locum in Origen, *Contra Celsum*, tr. by H. Chadwick (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 501–02. For more on this issue, see P. Fredriksen and O. Irshai, 'Christian Anti-Judaism: Polemics and Policies', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (Cambridge, forthcoming), IV.

[122] It has been suggested that Origen did sense the approaching storm; see *Contra Celsum,* 3.15 and H. Chadwick's Introduction to the English translation, p. xv.

as Alexander of Jerusalem, were arrested and tortured.[123] Though Origen survived the hardships of the Roman prison, his health deteriorated and he died *c.* 254 at the age of sixty-nine.[124]

With Origen's death — at least as far as Eusebius's account of the history of the Palestinian Church and in particular in Caesarea was concerned — an era had come to an end. It is somewhat surprising that Eusebius's record of the events that took place during the period following Decius's Persecution, which essentially was for him contemporary history, is rather dull. It could well be that nothing of great importance for his narrative occurred in Palestine. However, if we do seek a possible reason, it would seem that the towering figure of Dionysius of Alexandria that dominated Eusebius's description (Book VII) left little room for the local Palestinian bishops. Thus we hear only of Theoctistus of Caesarea and Mazabanes of Aelia's involvement in the initial stages of the Novatian schism and of another spell of persecutions under Valerian (*c.* 258–59) that resulted in the martyrdom of three countrymen who sought their fate at the hands of the local Caesarean governor.[125] The only major event in the annals of the Palestinian Church between

[123] On Decius's persecutions and their significance in the political and religious spheres of the period see J. B. Rives, 'The Decree of Decius and the Religion of the Empire', *JRS*, 89 (1999), 135–54. On Origen's fate see Eusebius, *HE* 6.39, 5. Reading Eusebius's description of the tortures undergone by Origen it is difficult to escape the impression that Eusebius wished to impart to his readers that though Origen in reality did not suffer martyrdom he nonetheless fully fulfilled the martyr's *code of conduct*. In that sense the later martyrs of the Great Persecution (303–311), whose fate was so vividly described by Eusebius, were in a sense on the path of *imitatio Origenis*. On another level the resemblance of the martyrlike episode concerning Origen to rabbinic martyr stories (especially of Rabbi Akiva, BT Berakhot 61b and parallels) is also quite striking; see D. Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford, 1999), pp. 122–23.

[124] Notwithstanding what has been suggested in the previous note, Nautin, p. 441 has rightfully claimed that had Origen died as a martyr it would have definitely affected the fate of his memory and saved it from the claws of his later detractors. For Origen's age at his death see Eusebius, *HE* 7.1.

[125] On the Novatian schism see Eusebius, *HE* 7.4–5, and on the martyrs during the reign of Valerian, ibid., 12. To those three martyrs Eusebius adds (ibid.) the case of a female martyr who was of the Marcionite heretical sect, and later on (ibid., 15) recounts the martyrdom story of the Caesarean Marinus, a high-ranking officer in the army who was lured by the local bishop, Theotecnus, to obtain the crown of faith. It would seem that the assemblage of these cases of martyrdom in Eusebius's narrative served as a prelude to his major account of the Great Persecution of his times in *The Martyrs of Palestine*. The fact that those martyrs met their noble death in Caesarea enhanced the importance of that see in the developing contest over the local Palestinian primacy.

then and the outbreak of hostilities in the dark days of the Great Persecution reported by Eusebius was the central role of the local leaders of that Church, Hymenaeus of Jerusalem and Theotecnus of Caesarea, in the deposition of Paul of Samosata, who served as the bishop of Antioch during the sixties of the third century.[126] It would seem that the key role played by the two prelates in those proceedings could be seen as the culmination of the prominent status the Palestinian ecclesiastical leaders had attained, not in the least through Origen's presence and fame as a theologian and ardent combatant against heresy. According to many scholars this seemingly isolated episode carried great repercussions for later generations. Paul's heretical views might have heralded the initial stages of the great schisms of the fourth century; thus, this affair merits a closer and more detailed observation.

There is much obscurity as to what Paul really preached. Most of what is known about his opinions is culled from what was written by his opponents, whether those by who confronted him at the Church councils convened to discuss his case or by later commentators on his doctrines who used records of his interrogation as their source.[127] The latter, such as the fourth-century Church Fathers Athanasius of Alexandria, Epiphanius of Salamis, Philastrius, and John Chrysostom, as well as Theodoret of Cyrrhus in the fifth century, placed special emphasis on the affinity of Paul's ideas with Jewish notions, a claim that seemed to be somewhat too simplistic. However, a close look at the epistle of the bishops, sent out following

[126] Eusebius, *HE* 7.27, 2–8, 2; 29.1–30, 17.

[127] Paul's career, too, is rather obscure, though alongside his office in the church he held a high Roman administrative position as a *ducenarius* which, according to his detractors, he cherished more; see Eusebius, *HE* 7.30, 8, and F. Millar, 'Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian: The Church, Local Culture and Political Allegiance in Third-Century Syria' *JRS*, 61 (1971), 10–17; F. Norris, 'Paul of Samosata: Procurator Ducenarius', *JTS*, n.s. 35 (1984), 50–70. Others, however, doubt whether he actually held that office and argue that he rather imitated the style of such officials; see J. Burke, 'Eusebius on Paul of Samosata: A New Image', *Kleronomia*, 7 (1975), 8–20. It was precisely his social conduct and his arrogant public behaviour that was so denounced by his opponents — the members of the council that tried him, prominent among whom were Hymanaeus of Jerusalem and Theotecnus of Caesarea; see Eusebius, ibid., 8–10, 12–16, and V. Burrus, 'Rhetorical Stereotypes in the Portrait of Paul of Samosata', *VC*, 43 (1989), 215–25. It would seem that these issues were of prime importance in their eyes, especially if we take into account the legacy of Origen's lifestyle — highlighted by Eusebius, *HE* 6.3, 9–12 — which left its mark on his pagan and Christian followers alike; see, ibid., 13.

the dialogue with the presbyter Malchion and prior to the deposition of Paul, discloses a theological world that had something in common with monotheistic concepts.[128]

It should be emphasized that the views he perhaps held in common with Judaeo-Christian notions were only partial, and certainly did not entirely colour Paul's Christological doctrine.[129] Though these views were, in all likelihood, the doctrines censured by the participants in the Church councils, especially the final one held in 268, during which Paul was deposed and excommunicated. Paul's opponents greatly feared his theology, this at a time when the clear outlines of Christian dogma had not yet taken shape.[130]

[128] The surviving fragments of the proceedings of the second church council, at which Paul was deposed and excommunicated late in 268, have been collected and discussed by several scholars. See, primarily, H. de Riedmatten, *Les Actes du procès de Paul de Samosate* (Freiburg, 1952), pp. 136–68. Today there is almost unanimous agreement that these fragments are not authentic, and that they reflect an additional and later stratum of the Christological polemic. See, in short, M. Richard, 'Malchion et Paul de Samosate: Le témoignage de Eusèbe de Cesarée', *Ephemerides theologociae lovanienses*, 35 (1959), 325–30; R. L. Sample, 'The Christology of the Council of Antioch (268 CE) Reconsidered', *CH*, 48 (1979), 18–26. It must be emphasized that much doubt has been levelled at what could be called the dossier of Paul's heretical views assembled from different fragments. On the *status quaestionis* of this issue, see the recent summary by M. Slusser, in his entry 'Paulus von Samosata', *TRE*, (Berlin, 1996), XXVI, 160–61, and more in the following note.

[129] See the sources in Millar, pp. 12–13. In addition, two previously unknown fragments written by Paul himself have been discovered and published. They were preserved in a manuscript of a work by Pamphilus of Jerusalem (sixth century). See J. Declerck, 'Deux nouveaux fragments attribués à Paul de Samosate', *Byzantion*, 54 (1984), 132. It is interesting to note that one of the central documents in this entire episode, the epistle of the bishops to Paul, came to be known as 'The Epistle of Hymenaeus', perhaps pointing to the central role of the bishop of Jerusalem in the campaign against this heresy.

[130] For this epistle, its text, and historical importance, see G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate: Études historiques* (Leuven, 1929), pp. 9–34, esp. 28–34. See also Eusebius, *HE* 7.27, 2 (p. 702) for a concept very similar to and more explicit than that adopted by Beryllus, and compare the views cited in an earlier work of Eusebius, *Eclogae Propheticae,* 3.19 (PG, 26, col. 1135). Paul believed that Jesus's human nature was the predominant one, and therefore considered him to be a messiah of the House of David (see Riedmatten, *Actes*, p. 137, fragment no. 6, and more). On Paul's views and of Christological terminology in conjunction with the dogmatic polemics of the fourth century, see R. D. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (London, 1987), pp. 159–60. Notwithstanding all this, it is rather doubtful whether Paul's heretical opinions can be linked to the dogmatic controversies that split the church in the following centuries. The attempts made during the fourth century by Eusebius and other Church Fathers to point to Paul as the progenitor of some of the heresies that arose in the Church during that

Throughout all the encounters and councils described above, the two leading sees in Palestine conducted their ecclesiastical affairs hand in hand, though primacy had — at least in Eusebius's presentation — shifted from the Church of Aeila to that of Caesarea. The seeming harmony and concord existing between the two centres were to be shattered in the wake of the Great Persecutions at the beginning of the fourth century, followed by the rise of the new dawn of Christendom under Constantine the Great.[131]

century have not been proven. See H. C. Brennecke, 'Zum Prozes gegen Paul von Samosata: Die Frage nach der Verurteilung des Homoousios', *AHC*, 75 (1984), 270–90.

[131] On this intricate chapter in fourth-century Palestinian Christian politics see my forthcoming study, 'The Dark Side of the Moon' (see note 12, above).